arXiv:1510.06391v5 [quant-ph] 28 Jul 2016

A Suggested Answer To Wallstrom's Criticism: Zitterbewegung Stochastic Mechanics I

Maaneli Derakhshani*

July 29, 2016

Institute for History and Foundations of Science & Department of Mathematics, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands[1]

Abstract

Wallstrom's criticism of existing formulations of stochastic mechanics is that they fail to derive quantum theory because they require an ad hoc quantization condition on the postulated velocity potential, S, in order to derive single-valued Schrödinger wave functions. We propose an answer to this criticism by modifying the Nelson-Yasue formulation of non-relativistic stochastic mechanics for a spinless particle with the following hypothesis: a spinless Nelson-Yasue particle of rest mass m continuously undergoes a driven mean oscillation of constant 'zitterbewegung' (zbw) frequency, $\omega_c = (1/\hbar)\, mc^2$, in its mean rest frame. With this hypothesis we show that, in the mean lab frame, S arises as the mean zbw phase for an ensemble of such particles, satisfies the required quantization condition, and evolves in time by the Hamilton-Jacobi-Madelung equations. The paper begins by reviewing Nelson-Yasue stochastic mechanics and Wallstrom's criticism, after which we develop a classical model of a particle of rest mass m constrained to undergo the hypothesized zbw oscillation, with the purpose of making clear the physical assumptions of the zbw model without the added complications of stochastic mechanics. We develop the classical model for the spinless one-particle case, without and with field interactions, and then carry out the analogous developments for the Nelson-Yasue version of this model. Using this 'zitterbewegung stochastic mechanics' (ZSM), we readily derive the single-valued wave functions of non-relativistic quantum mechanics for a spinless particle in the analyzed cases. We also apply ZSM to the case of a central potential and show that it predicts angular momentum quantization. This paper sets the foundation for Part II, which will (primarily) work out the many-particle version of ZSM.

*Email: maanelid@yahoo.com and m.derakhshani@uu.nl

[1]Address when this work was initiated: Department of Physics & Astronomy, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE 68588, USA.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Nelson-Yasue Stochastic Mechanics **4**

3 Wallstrom's Criticism **8**

4 Classical Model of Constrained Zitterbewegung Motion **10**
4.1 One free particle 11
4.2 Classical Hamilton-Jacobi statistical mechanics for one free particle 12
4.3 One particle interacting with external fields 13
4.4 Classical Hamilton-Jacobi statistical mechanics for one particle interacting with external fields 15

5 Zitterbewegung Stochastic Mechanics **17**
5.1 One free particle 17
5.2 One particle interacting with external fields 21
5.3 The central potential revisited 24

6 Conclusion **25**

7 Acknowledgments **25**

A Proof of the Stochastic Variational Principle **25**

B Classical Zitterbewegung in the Central Potential **26**

1 Introduction

Since its introduction by Fényes in 1952 [1], the goal of the stochastic mechanics research program has been to derive quantum theory from a classical-like statistical mechanics of particles undergoing Brownian motion. Towards this end, non-relativistic and relativistic models of stochastic mechanics have been constructed for both spin-0 particles [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32] and spin-1/2 particles [33, 22, 34, 35, 31]. A non-relativistic theory of single-time and multi-time measurements has also been developed [36, 37, 38, 39, 40], as have extensions of non-relativistic stochastic mechanics to finite temperature and non-equilibrium open systems [5, 41, 42, 19, 43]. Field theoretic generalizations also exist, for the cases of scalar fields [44, 45, 46, 10, 47], Maxwell fields [48, 49], vector-meson fields [50], the linearized gravitational field [51], coupling to dissipative environments [45, 52], non-Abelian gauge theory [6], bosonic string theory [53], M-theory [25], and background-independent quantum gravity [26]. However, Wallstrom [54, 55] pointed out that extant formulations of stochastic mechanics ultimately fail to derive quantum mechanics because they require an "*ad hoc*" quantization condition on the postulated velocity potential, S, in order to recover single-valued Schrödinger wave functions. Moreover, this criticism appears to generalize to the field-theoretic and quantum gravitational versions of stochastic mechanics developed before, during, and after Wallstrom's publications, insofar as they require analogous quantization conditions and don't seem to give non-circular justifications for them.

Since Wallstrom, sporadic attempts have been made to answer his criticism [56, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62]. However, in our view, all these attempts are either problematic or limited in their applicability to stochastic mechanics (the follow up paper, Part II, will give a discussion). Nevertheless, if a convincing answer can be found, stochastic mechanics may once again be viewed as a viable research program, and one that (in our view) offers elegant solutions to many of the foundational problems with quantum mechanics. As examples, stochastic mechanics would provide: (1) an unambiguous solution to the quantum measurement problem (the local beables of the theory on which measurement outcomes depend are point masses with definite trajectories at all times) [38, 40]; (2) an unambiguous physical interpretation of the wave function (it is an epistemic wave field in the sense of being defined for a fictitious statistical ensemble of point masses undergoing conservative diffusions) [4, 55]; (3) an explanation for why the position basis is preferred in decoherence theory (the form of the

Schrödinger Hamiltonian is derived from the particle diffusion process in position space) [57, 19]; and (4) a derivation of the symmetry postulates for wave functions of identical particles (they arise from natural symmetry conditions on the particle trajectories, with the possibility of parastatistics being excluded) [4, 37, 17].

Compare this to the 'standard' approaches to interpreting or reformulating the quantum formalism in a realist way that solves the measurement problem, e.g. Many-Worlds interpretations [63, 64], de Broglie-Bohm theories [65, 66, 67], and dynamical collapse theories [68, 69]. In all these approaches, the wave function is typically interpreted as fundamental and ontic, and the Schrödinger evolution (or some nonlinear modification of it) is taken as a dynamical law. So if stochastic mechanics succeeds in deriving the Schrödinger equation and wave function, it constitutes the first known example of a measurement-problem-free ontological reconstruction of quantum mechanics in which the wave function could be considered (in a well-defined sense) derived and epistemic, and the Schrödinger evolution phenomenological rather than law-like[2]. Arguably then, the viability of stochastic mechanics would undercut the primacy of the aforementioned standard approaches - it would no longer be necessary to interpret the wave function as fundamental and ontic, and presume the Schrödinger evolution as law-like, in order to have an ontological formulation of quantum theory that solves the measurement problem, is empirically adequate, and has a coherent physical interpretation.

It is also noteworthy that, as a dynamical theory of particle motion in which probabilities play no fundamental role, stochastic mechanics shares with de Broglie-Bohm theories the ability to justify the "quantum equilibrium" density $|\psi|^2$ from typicality arguments [71] and from dynamical relaxation of non-equilibrium densities to future equilibrium [15, 16, 18]. As a result, stochastic mechanics can, on its own terms, be regarded as a more general physical theory that contains quantum mechanics as a fixed point - and outside this fixed point, it admits the possibility of non-equilibrium physics, e.g. measurements more precise than the uncertainty principle allows and superluminal signaling [4, 72, 73, 74].

For all these reasons, it seems worthwhile to consider whether the central obstacle for the stochastic mechanics research program - Wallstrom's criticism - can be surmounted. The objective of this series of papers is to suggest how non-relativistic stochastic mechanics for spinless particles can be modified to provide a non-ad-hoc physical justification for the required quantization condition on S, and thereby recover all and only the single-valued wave functions of non-relativistic quantum mechanics. In this paper, we propose to modify the Nelson-Yasue formulation [4, 7] of non-relativistic stochastic mechanics for a spinless particle with the following hypothesis: a spinless particle of rest mass, m, bounded to a harmonic potential of natural frequency, $\omega_c = (1/\hbar)\, mc^2$, and immersed in Nelson's hypothetical ether medium (appropriately modified in its properties), undergoes a driven mean oscillation of constant zitterbewegung frequency, ω_c, in its instantaneous mean rest frame. With this hypothesis we show that, in the mean lab frame, the stochastic mechanical velocity potential, S, arises as the mean zitterbewegung phase for an ensemble of such particles, implies the needed quantization condition, and evolves by the stochastically derived Hamilton-Jacobi-Madelung equations. This modification of Nelson-Yasue stochastic mechanics (NYSM), which we term 'zitterbewegung stochastic mechanics' (ZSM), then allows us to derive the single-valued wave functions of non-relativistic quantum mechanics for a spinless particle. The problem of justifying the quantization condition is thereby reduced to justifying the zitterbewegung hypothesis. Accordingly, it is among the tasks of Part II to argue that the hypothesis can be justified in terms of physical/dynamical models and can be plausibly generalized to particles with spin as well as relativistic particles and fields.

The outline of this paper is as follows. In section 2, we give a concise review of the formal derivation of the Schrödinger equation from NYSM for a single, spinless particle in an external scalar potential. (Such a review will be useful for the reader who is unfamiliar with NYSM, and essential for following the logic and presentation of the arguments later in the paper.) In section 3, we review the Wallstrom criticism. In section 4, we introduce a classical model of a spinless zitterbewegung particle which implies the quantization condition for the phase of its oscillation, excluding and including interactions with external fields. In each case, we extend the model to a classical Hamilton-Jacobi

[2]The recent "Many-Interacting-Worlds" (MIW) theory of Hall, Deckert, and Wiseman [70], shares some of these features in that it recovers the Schrödinger wave function as an effective, mean-field description of a large number of real classical worlds interacting through a non-classical (quantum) force. On the other hand, it seems that their approach is also subject to Wallstrom's criticism in that they also have to assume the quantization condition (or something like it) on the dynamics of their classical worlds.

statistical mechanics involving an ensemble of such particles, with the purpose of making as clear as possible the physical assumptions of the model in a well-established classical physics framework that has conceptual and mathematical similarities to stochastic mechanics. In section 5, we construct a Nelson-Yasue stochastic mechanics for the zitterbewegung particle (ZSM), excluding and including field interactions. In this way we derive one-particle Schrödinger equations with single-valued wave functions that have (generally) multi-valued phases, and use the hydrogen-like atom as a worked example.

This paper lays the foundation for Part II, where we will: (1) develop the (non-trivial) many-particle cases of ZSM, (2) explicate the beables of ZSM, (3) assess the plausibility and generalizability of the zitterbewegung hypothesis, and (4) compare ZSM to other proposed answers to Wallstrom's criticism.

2 Nelson-Yasue Stochastic Mechanics

In Edward Nelson's non-relativistic stochastic mechanics [2, 3, 4], it is first hypothesized that the vacuum is pervaded by a homogeneous and isotropic "ether" fluid with classical stochastic fluctuations of uniform character. [3] To ensure that observers in the ether can't distinguish absolute rest from uniform motion, it is further hypothesized that the interaction of a point mass with the ether is a frictionless diffusion process. [4] Accordingly, a point particle of mass m within this frictionless ether will in general have its position 3-vector $\mathbf{q}(t)$ constantly undergoing diffusive motion with drift, as modeled by the first-order stochastic differential equation,

$$d\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)dt + d\mathbf{W}(t). \tag{1}$$

The vector $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$ is the deterministic "mean forward" drift velocity of the particle, and $\mathbf{W}(t)$ is the Wiener process modeling the effect of the particle's interaction with the fluctuating ether.

The Wiener increment, $d\mathbf{W}(t)$, is assumed to be Gaussian with zero mean, independent of $d\mathbf{q}(s)$ for $s \leq t$, and with variance,

$$E_t\left[d\mathbf{W}_i(t)d\mathbf{W}_j(t)\right] = 2\nu\delta_{ij}dt, \tag{2}$$

where E_t denotes the conditional expectation at time t. [5] It is further hypothesized that the magnitude of the diffusion coefficient ν is proportional to the reduced Planck's constant, and inversely proportional to the particle mass m so that

$$\nu = \frac{\hbar}{2m}. \tag{3}$$

In addition to (1), the particle's trajectory $\mathbf{q}(t)$ can also satisfy the time-reversed equation

$$d\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t)dt + d\mathbf{W}_*(t), \tag{4}$$

where $\mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$ is the mean backward drift velocity, and $d\mathbf{W}_*(t) = d\mathbf{W}(-t)$ is the backward Wiener process. The $d\mathbf{W}_*(t)$ has all the properties of $d\mathbf{W}(t)$, except that it is independent of $d\mathbf{q}(s)$ for $s \geq t$. With these conditions on $d\mathbf{W}(t)$ and $d\mathbf{W}_*(t)$, (1) and (4) respectively define forward and backward Markov processes on $\mathbb{R}^3$.

[3] The microscopic constituents of this ether are left unspecified by Nelson; however, he suggests by tentative dimensional arguments relating to the choice of diffusion constant in Eq. (3) (namely, that we can write $\hbar = e^2/\alpha c$, where α is the fine-structure constant and e the elementary charge) that it may have an electromagnetic origin [4].

[4] Nelson points out [4] that this frictionless diffusion process is an example of "conservative diffusions", or diffusions in which the mean energy of the particle is conserved in time (for a time-independent external potential). In other words, on the average, there is no net transfer of energy between the particle and the fluctuating ether, in contrast to classical Brownian diffusions which are fundamentally dissipative in character.

[5] Note that although Equations (1-2) are formally the same as those used for the kinematical description of classical Brownian motion in the Einstein-Smoluchowski (E-S) theory, the physical context is different; the E-S theory uses (1-2) to model the Brownian motion of macroscopic particles in a classical fluid in the large friction limit [3], whereas Nelson uses (1-2) to model frictionless stochastic motion (conservative diffusions) for elementary particles interacting with a fluctuating ether fluid that permeates the vacuum.

Associated to the trajectory $\mathbf{q}(t)$ is the probability density $\rho(\mathbf{q},t) = n(\mathbf{q},t)/N$, where $n(\mathbf{q},t)$ is the number of particles per unit volume and N is the total number of particles in a definite region of space. Corresponding to (1) and (4), then, are the forward and backward Fokker-Planck equations,

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\mathbf{q},t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot [\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q},t)\rho(\mathbf{q},t)] + \frac{\hbar}{2m}\nabla^2 \rho(\mathbf{q},t), \tag{5}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\mathbf{q},t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot [\mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q},t)\rho(\mathbf{q},t)] - \frac{\hbar}{2m}\nabla^2 \rho(\mathbf{q},t), \tag{6}$$

where we require that $\rho(\mathbf{q},t)$ satisfies the normalization condition,

$$\int \rho_0(\mathbf{q}) d^3q = 1. \tag{7}$$

A conservative diffusion process implies that the process has a time-symmetric probability density evolution. The Fokker-Planck equations (5-6), on the other hand, describe time-asymmetric evolutions in opposite time directions. The reason is that, given all possible solutions to (1), one can define as many forward processes as there are possible initial distributions satisfying (5); likewise, given all possible solutions to (4), one can define as many backward processes as there are possible 'initial' distributions satisfying (6). Consequently, the forward and backward processes are both underdetermined, and neither (1) nor (4) has a well-defined time-reversal. We therefore require additional constraints on (5-6) to make them symmetric in *both* time directions for a common probability density. To do this, Nelson imposes three time-symmetric kinematic constraints. First, Nelson imposes that the average of (5) and (6) gives the continuity equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\mathbf{q},t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot \left[\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q},t) + \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q},t)\right)\rho(\mathbf{q},t)\right], \tag{8}$$

where

$$\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}.t) = \frac{1}{2}\left[\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q},t) + \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q},t)\right] \tag{9}$$

is the associated mean "current velocity" field.

Second, Nelson imposes the constraint

$$\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}.t) = \frac{\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t)}{m}, \tag{10}$$

or that the current velocity is irrotational. (If vorticity were allowed, then the time-reversal operation would change the orientation of the curl, thus distinguishing time directions [75, 18].) Physically speaking, the function S is interpreted as the velocity potential for a Gibbsian statistical ensemble of fictitious, non-interacting, identical particles, where each particle in the ensemble differs from the other in its initial position (hence the dependence of S on the generalized coordinate $\mathbf{q}$) and initial irrotational mean flow velocity given by (10). [6] It is thereby analogous to the S function used in the Hamilton-Jacobi formulation of classical statistical mechanics for a single point particle [78, 79, 65, 80, 81, 82].

Accordingly, (8) becomes

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\mathbf{q},t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot \left[\frac{\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t)}{m}\rho(\mathbf{q},t)\right], \tag{11}$$

which is now a time-reversal invariant evolution equation for $\rho(\mathbf{q},t)$.

Third, Nelson notes that the difference of (6) and (5) yields the "osmotic velocity" field,

$$\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{q},t) = \frac{\hbar}{2m}\frac{\nabla \rho(\mathbf{q},t)}{\rho(\mathbf{q},t)} = \frac{1}{2}\left[\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q},t) - \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q},t)\right]. \tag{12}$$

[6] Of course, one can still add to ∇S a solenoidal vector field of any magnitude and, upon insertion into (8), recover the same continuity equation [76, 77]. But the assumption of only irrotational flow velocity is the simplest one, and as we already mentioned, it follows from the requirement of time symmetry for the kinematics of the diffusion process.

As a consequence of (9), (10), and (12), $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{b}_* = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}$, which when inserted back into (5) and (6) returns (11). In other words, the forward and backward Fokker-Planck equations, under these constraints, reduce to the same time-reversal invariant continuity equation. So (9), (10), and (12) together fix ρ as the common, single-time, 'equilibrium' probability density (in analogy with a thermal equilibrium density) for solutions of (1) and (4), even though it is a time-dependent density.

In our view, the physical meaning of (12) has been misconstrued by some researchers [83, 84, 58, 85] to imply that ρ must be interpreted as the physical cause of the osmotic velocity of Nelson's particle. We want to stress that this is not the case, and that such an interpretation would be logically and physically inconsistent with the definition of ρ as a probability density. Rather, Nelson physically motivates his osmotic velocity by analogy with the osmotic velocity in the E-S theory [2, 3] - essentially, he postulates the presence of an external (i.e., not sourced by the particle) potential, $U(\mathbf{q}, t)$, which couples to the particle via some coupling constant, μ, such that $R(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \mu U(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$ defines a 'potential momentum' for the particle. [7] (Hereafter we shall permit ourselves to refer to $U(\mathbf{q}, t)$ and $R(\mathbf{q}, t)$ interchangeably as the 'osmotic potential'.) When $U(\mathbf{q}, t)$ is spatially varying, it imparts to the particle a momentum, $\nabla R(\mathbf{q}, t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}$, which is then counter-balanced by the ether fluid's osmotic impulse pressure, $(\hbar/2m)\,\nabla ln[n(\mathbf{q}, t)]|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}$. So, physically, Nelson's osmotic velocity is the equilibrium velocity acquired by the particle when $\nabla R/m = (\hbar/2m)\,\nabla\rho/\rho$ (using $\rho = n/N$), which implies that ρ depends on R as $\rho = e^{2R/\hbar}$ for all times. Hence, the *physical cause* of $\mathbf{u}$ is R (or technically U), and (12) is just a mathematically equivalent and convenient rewriting of this relation.

So far we have only presented the kinematics of Nelson's particle. To present the dynamics, we must first motivate Nelson's analogues of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck mean derivatives. In the Itô calculus, the mean forward and backward derivatives of a solution $\mathbf{q}(t)$ satisfying (1) and (4) are respectively defined as

$$D\mathbf{q}(t) = \lim_{\Delta t \to 0^+} E_t \left[\frac{q(t + \Delta t) - q(t)}{\Delta t} \right], \tag{13}$$

and

$$D_*\mathbf{q}(t) = \lim_{\Delta t \to 0^+} E_t \left[\frac{q(t) - q(t - \Delta t)}{\Delta t} \right]. \tag{14}$$

Because $d\mathbf{W}(t)$ and $d\mathbf{W}_*(t)$ are Gaussian with zero mean, it follows that $D\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$ and $D_*\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$. To compute the second mean derivative, $D\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$ (or $D_*\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$), we must expand $\mathbf{b}$ in a Taylor series up to terms of order two in $d\mathbf{q}(t)$:

$$d\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \frac{\partial \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)}{\partial t} dt + d\mathbf{q}(t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} dq_i(t) dq_j(t) \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)}{\partial q_i \partial q_j} + \ldots, \tag{15}$$

From (1), we can replace $dx_i(t)$ by $dW_i(t)$ in the last term, and when taking the average in (13), we can replace $d\mathbf{q}(t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$ by $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$ since $d\mathbf{W}(t)$ is independent of $\mathbf{q}(t)$ and has mean 0. Using (2-3), we then obtain

$$D\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \nabla + \frac{\hbar}{2m} \nabla^2 \right] \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t), \tag{16}$$

and likewise

$$D_*\mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \nabla - \frac{\hbar}{2m} \nabla^2 \right] \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t). \tag{17}$$

[7] It should be emphasized that $U(\mathbf{q}, t)$ is not defined over an ensemble of systems, but is a real physical field on 3-space analogous to the classical external potential, $V(\mathbf{q}, t)$, that causes the osmotic velocity of a Brownian particle in the E-S theory. Nelson does not specify whether $U(\mathbf{q}, t)$ is sourced by the ether or is an independently existing field on space-time, nor does he specify whether the coupling μ corresponds to any of the fundamental force interactions of the Standard Model. These elements of his theory are phenomenological hypotheses that presumably should be made more precise in a 'deeper' extension of stochastic mechanics. Nonetheless, as we will see in Part II, the many-particle extension of stochastic mechanics puts additional constraints on how the osmotic potential should be understood.

Using (16-17), along with Newton's 2nd law, Nelson wanted to construct an expression for the mean acceleration of the particle consistent with the principle of time-symmetry. He proposed

$$m\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}(t),t) = \frac{m}{2}\left[D_*D + DD_*\right]\mathbf{q}(t) = -\nabla V(\mathbf{q},t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}. \tag{18}$$

Physically, this equation says that the mean acceleration Nelson's particle feels in the presence of an external (conservative) force is the equal-weighted average of its mean forward drift $\mathbf{b}$ transported backwards in time, with its mean backward drift $\mathbf{b}_*$ transported forwards in time. It is this peculiar mean dynamics that preserves the time-symmetry of Nelson's diffusion process.

Of course, other time-symmetric mean accelerations are possible. For example, $(1/2)[D^2+D_*^2]\mathbf{q}(t)$, or any weighted average of this with (18). So it may be asked: what other physical principles (if any) privilege Nelson's choice? As first shown by Yasue [7, 8] and later adopted by Nelson [4], a physically well-motivated stochastic variational principle can give (18). [8] Consider the ensemble-averaged, time-symmetric mean action

$$\begin{aligned} J(\mathbf{q}) &= \int d^3q\rho(\mathbf{q},t)\int_{t_i}^{t_f}\left\{\frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t),t)^2 + \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t),t)^2\right] - V(\mathbf{q}(t),t)\right\}dt \\ &= \int d^3q\rho\int_{t_i}^{t_f}\left\{\frac{1}{2}mv^2 + \frac{1}{2}mu^2 - V\right\}dt. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

In other words, for a particle in a (possibly) time-dependent potential V, undergoing the Markov processes given by (1) and (4), and with the kinematic constraints (9), (10), and (12), there is a time-symmetric mean Lagrangian obtained by averaging together the mean Lagrangians associated with the mean forward and backward processes. The ensemble averaged action obtained from this time-symmetric mean Lagrangian then corresponds to (19). Upon imposing the conservative diffusion condition through the variational principle,

$$J = \int d^3q\rho\int_{t_i}^{t_f}\left\{\frac{1}{2}mv^2 + \frac{1}{2}mu^2 - V\right\}dt = extremal, \tag{20}$$

a straightforward computation (see Appendix A) shows that this implies (18) as the equation of motion. If, instead, we had allowed the mean kinetic energy terms in (19) to not be positive-definite and used the alternative time-symmetric mean kinetic energy, $(1/2)m\mathbf{b}\mathbf{b}_* = (1/2)m(v^2-u^2)$, then it can be shown [86, 84, 13] that imposing (20) would give the alternative time-symmetric mean acceleration involving the derivatives $[D^2+D_*^2]$. [9] So Nelson's mean acceleration choice is justified by the principle of time-symmetry *and* the natural physical requirement that all the contributions to the mean kinetic energy of the Nelsonian particle should be positive-definite.

By applying the mean derivatives in (18) to $\mathbf{q}(t)$, using that $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{v}+\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{b}_* = \mathbf{v}-\mathbf{u}$, and removing the dependence of the mean acceleration on the actual particle trajectory $\mathbf{q}(t)$ so that $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}(t),t)$ gets replaced by $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q},t)$, a straightforward computation gives

$$\begin{aligned} m\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q},t) &= m\left[\frac{\partial\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q},t)}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q},t)\cdot\nabla\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q},t) - \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{q},t)\cdot\nabla\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{q},t) - \frac{\hbar}{2m}\nabla^2\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{q},t)\right] \\ &= \nabla\left[\frac{\partial S(\mathbf{q},t)}{\partial t} + \frac{\left(\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t)\right)^2}{2m} - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\frac{\nabla^2\sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q},t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q},t)}}\right] = -\nabla V(\mathbf{q},t), \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q},t)$ is the acceleration field over a Gibbsian statistical ensemble of point masses when $\mathbf{q}(t)$ is not known [65]. Integrating both sides of (21), and setting the arbitrary integration constants equal to zero, we then obtain the Quantum Hamilton-Jacobi equation,

[8] Another widely used stochastic variational principle is the one due to Guerra and Morato [11]. We don't use their approach because it requires that S is single-valued in addition to ∇S. This excludes the possibility of systems with angular momentum [54] and therefore will not be applicable to our proposed answer to Wallstrom's criticism.

[9] Additionally, Davidson [13] showed that by defining a Lagrangian of the form $(1/2)m\left[(1/2)\left(\mathbf{b}^2+\mathbf{b}_*^2\right) - (\beta/8)(\mathbf{b}-\mathbf{b}_*)^2\right]$, where β is a constant, the resulting equation of motion is also equivalent to the usual Schrödinger equation, provided that the diffusion coefficient $\nu = (1/\sqrt{1-\beta/2})\frac{\hbar}{2m}$. We can see, however, that our criterion of restricting the kinetic energy terms in the Lagrangian to only terms that are positive-definite, excludes Davidson's choice of Lagrangian too.

$$-\frac{\partial S(\mathbf{q},t)}{\partial t}=\frac{\left(\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t)\right)^{2}}{2m}+V(\mathbf{q},t)-\frac{\hbar^{2}}{2m}\frac{\nabla^{2}\sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q},t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q},t)}}, \tag{22}$$

which describes the total energy field over the ensemble, and upon evaluation at $\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)$, the total energy of the actual point mass along its actual mean trajectory.

Although the last term on the right hand side of (22) is often called the "quantum potential", we note that it arises here from the osmotic kinetic energy term in (19). So the quantum potential must be physically understood in stochastic mechanics as a kinetic energy field (which hereafter we prefer to call the 'quantum kinetic' for accuracy of meaning) arising from the osmotic velocity field over the ensemble.

The pair of nonlinear equations coupling the evolution of ρ and S, as given by (11) and (22), are generally known as the Hamilton-Jacobi-Madelung (HJM) equations, and can be formally identified with the imaginary and real parts of the Schrödinger equation under polar decomposition [87, 65]. Therefore, (11) and (22) can be formally rewritten as the Schrödinger equation,

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\psi(\mathbf{q},t)}{\partial t}=-\frac{\hbar^{2}}{2m}\nabla^{2}\psi(\mathbf{q},t)+V(\mathbf{q},t)\psi(\mathbf{q},t), \tag{23}$$

where $\psi(\mathbf{q},t)=\sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q},t)}e^{iS(\mathbf{q},t)/\hbar}$. In contrast to other ontological formulations of quantum mechanics, this wave function must be interpreted as an epistemic field in the sense that it encodes information about the possible position and momenta states that the actual particle can occupy at any instant, since it is defined in terms of the ensemble variables ρ and S. [10] Although the treatment here did not include coupling to electromagnetic potentials, it is straightforward to do so [4] (see also Appendix A).

3 Wallstrom's Criticism

In the previous section, we referred to the correspondence between the HJM equations and (23) as only formal because we had not considered the boundary conditions that must be imposed on solutions of the Schrödinger equation and the HJM equations, respectively, in order for mathematical equivalence to be established. In standard quantum mechanics, it is well-known that physical wave functions satisfying the Schrödinger equation are required to be single-valued. For the HJM equations, it was not specified in the Nelson-Yasue derivation whether S is assumed to be single-valued, arbitrarily multi-valued, or multi-valued in accordance with a quantization condition. Wallstrom [54, 55] showed that for all existing formulations of stochastic mechanics, all these possible conditions on S are problematic in one way or another.

If S is constrained to be single-valued, then stochastic mechanical theories exclude single-valued Schrödinger wave functions with angular momentum. This is so because single-valued wave functions with angular momentum have phase factors of the form $\exp\left(i\mathrm{m}\varphi\right)$, where m is an integer and φ is the azimuthal angle, which implies that $S(\varphi)=\mathrm{m}\hbar\varphi$. By contrast, if S is assumed to be arbitrarily multi-valued, they produce all the single-valued wave functions of the Schrödinger equation, along with infinitely many multi-valued 'wave functions', which smoothly interpolate between the single-valued wave functions. This can be seen by comparing solutions of the Schrödinger and HJM equations for a two-dimensional central potential, $V(\mathbf{r})$ [54]. The Schrödinger equation with $V(\mathbf{r})$ has single-valued wave functions of the form $\psi_{\mathrm{m}}(\mathbf{r},\varphi)=R_{\mathrm{m}}(\mathbf{r})exp(i\mathrm{m}\varphi)$, where $\psi_{\mathrm{m}}(\mathbf{r},\varphi)=\psi_{\mathrm{m}}(\mathbf{r},\varphi+2\pi n)$, implying that m is an integer. For the HJM equations, however, the solutions $\rho_{\mathrm{m}}=|R_{\mathrm{m}}(\mathbf{r})|^{2}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{\mathrm{m}}=(\mathrm{m}\hbar/mr)\,\hat{\varphi}$ don't require m to be integral. To see this, consider the effective central potential, $V_a(\mathbf{r})=V(\mathbf{r})+a/r^2$, where a is a positive real constant. For this potential, consider the Schrödinger equation with stationary solution $\psi_a(\mathbf{r},\varphi)=R_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathbf{r})exp(i\varphi)$, where $\mathrm{m}=1$ and radial component corresponding to the ground state solution of the radial equation. This wave function yields osmotic and current velocities, $\mathbf{u}_a$ and $\mathbf{v}_a$, which satisfy (11) and (21) with the potential V_a:

[10] Though it may not be obvious here, this interpretation of the Nelson-Yasue wave function is not undermined by the Pusey-Barrett-Rudolph theorem [88]. Whereas this theorem assumes factorizability/separability of the "ontic state space", the ontic osmotic potential, U, which is encoded in the amplitude of the wave function via R and plays a role in the particle dynamics via (21), is in general not separable when extended to the N-particle case (as will be shown in Part II).

$$0 = \frac{\partial \rho_a}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v}_a \rho_a)\,, \tag{24}$$

$$0 = \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}_a}{\partial t} = -\nabla \left(V + \frac{a}{r^2} \right) - \mathbf{v}_a \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_a + \mathbf{u}_a \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_a + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 \mathbf{u}_a. \tag{25}$$

Using $\mathbf{v}_a = (\hbar/mr)\,\hat{\varphi}$ and $\mathbf{v}_a \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}_a = \nabla \left[m\mathbf{v}_a^2/2 \right]$, we can then rewrite (25) as

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= -\nabla V - \nabla \left(\frac{a}{r^2} + \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{v}_a^2 \right) + \mathbf{u}_a \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_a + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 \mathbf{u}_a \\ &= -\nabla V - \frac{m}{2} \nabla \left(\frac{2ma}{\hbar^2} + 1 \right) \mathbf{v}_a^2 + \mathbf{u}_a \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}_a + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 \mathbf{u}_a. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

This gives us $\mathbf{v}'_a = \mathbf{v}_a \sqrt{2ma/\hbar^2 + 1}$ and $\mathbf{u}'_a = \mathbf{u}_a$. Note that since a is a constant that can take any positive real value, $\mathbf{v}'_a$ is not quantized, and yet it is a solution of the HJM equations. By contrast, in the quantum mechanical version of this problem, we would have $V_a(\mathbf{r}) = V(\mathbf{r}) + \mathrm{m}^2/2r^2$, where $\mathrm{m} = \sqrt{2ma/\hbar^2 + 1}$ would be integral due to the single-valuedness condition on ψ_{m}. In other words, the $\mathbf{v}_a$ and $\mathbf{u}_a$ in stochastic mechanics only correspond to a single-valued wave function when a is an integer, and this is true of all systems of two dimensions or higher. Equivalently, we may say that the HJM equations predict a continuum of energy and momentum states for the particle, which smoothly interpolate between the quantized energy and momentum eigenvalues predicted by the quantum mechanical case. [11]

The only condition on S (and hence the current velocity $\mathbf{v}_a$) that allows stochastic mechanics to recover all and only the single-valued wave functions of the Schrödinger equation is the condition that the change in S around any closed loop L in space (with time held constant) is equal to an integer multiple of Planck's constant, [12] or

$$\oint_L dS = \oint_L \nabla S \cdot d\mathbf{q} = nh. \tag{27}$$

But this condition is arbitrary, Wallstrom argued, as there's no reason in stochastic mechanics why the change in S along L should be constrained to an integer multiple of h. Indeed, assuming this condition amounts to assuming that wave functions are single-valued, which amounts to assuming that the solution space of the Nelson-Yasue stochastic mechanical equations is equivalent to the solution space of the quantum mechanical Schrödinger equation. Such an assumption cannot be made, however, in a theory purporting to *derive* the Schrödinger equation of quantum mechanics.

These arguments notwithstanding, one might question whether the requirement of single-valued wave functions in quantum mechanics is any less arbitrary than imposing (27) in stochastic mechanics. This is not the case. The single-valuedness condition, as usually motivated, is a consequence of imposing two completely natural boundary conditions on solutions of (23): (a) that the solutions satisfy the linear superposition principle [90, 54], and (b) that $|\psi|^2$ can be physically interpreted as a probability density [91, 92, 93]. [13] Condition (a) is natural to the single-valuedness requirement because of the linearity of the Schrödinger equation, and condition (b) is natural to it because a probability density is, by definition, a single-valued function on its sample space. Moreover, it can

[11] Before Wallstrom's critiques, it was pointed out by Albeverio and Høegh-Krohn [89] as well as Goldstein [37] that, for the cases of stationary bound states with nodal surfaces that separate the manifold of diffusion into disjoint components, Nelson's equations (the HJM equations and his stochastic differential equations) contain more solutions than Schrödinger's equation. In addition, Goldstein [37] was the first to point out that solutions exist to the HJM equations which don't correspond to any single-valued solution of the Schrödinger equation, for the case of a multiply-connected configuration space. Nevertheless, Wallstrom's example of extraneous solutions is of a more general nature, as it applies to a simply-connected space where the diffusion process is not separated into disjoint components.

[12] Wallstrom notes that Takabayasi [87] was first to recognize the necessity of this quantization condition and suggests [private communication] that priority of credit for this discovery should go to him [55]. However, it seems that Takabayasi only recognized this issue in the context of Bohm's 1952 hidden-variables theory, even though Fényes proposed the first formulation of stochastic mechanics that same year [1]. Wallstrom appears to have been the first in the literature to recognize and discuss the full extent of this inequivalence in the context of stochastic mechanical theories.

[13] Henneberger et al. [94] argue that the single-valuedness condition on wave functions is strictly a consequence of the linear superposition principle. However, this nuance is inessential to our arguments.

be shown that if (a) doesn't hold then (b) doesn't hold for any linear superposition of two or more solutions. To illustrate this, consider the free particle Schrödinger equation on the unit circle, S^1: [14]

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\frac{1}{r^2}\frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial\theta^2} = E\psi. \tag{28}$$

The un-normalized wave function satisfying this equation is of the form $\psi(\theta) = Ne^{ik\theta}$, where $k = \frac{r}{\hbar}\sqrt{2mE}$. For this wave function to satisfy (b), k (and hence the energy E) can take any positive value among the real numbers since obviously $|\psi|^2 = N^2$. Consider now a superposition of the form $\psi_s(\theta) = N\left(e^{ik_1\theta} + e^{ik_2\theta}\right)$, which leads to the density

$$|\psi_s|^2 = 2N^2\left(1 + cos\left[(k_1 - k_2)\theta\right]\right). \tag{29}$$

If k_1 and k_2 are allowed to take non-integer values, then $(k_1 - k_2)$ can also take non-integer values, and the density formed from the superposition can be multi-valued, thereby violating (b). Condition (a) will also be violated since, although a single wave function in the superposition satisfies (b), the superposition does not; so the set of wave functions of the form $\psi(\theta) = Ne^{ik\theta}$, where k can take non-integer values, does not form a linear space. If, however, k_1 and k_2 are integers, then so is $(k_1 - k_2)$, and conditions (a) and (b) will be satisfied since $|\psi_s|^2$ will always be single-valued. Correspondingly, it follows that the energy and momentum of the particle on the unit circle will be quantized with $e^{i2\pi\frac{r}{\hbar}\sqrt{2mE}} = 1 = e^{i2\pi n}$ yielding $E_n = \frac{p_\theta^2}{2mr^2} = \frac{n^2\hbar^2}{2mr^2}$, where n is an integer.

The wave functions constructed from stochastic mechanics will therefore satisfy only (b) if S is arbitrarily multi-valued, while they will satisfy (a) and (b) together only when (27) is imposed. But as previously mentioned, (27) is ad hoc in stochastic mechanics, and assuming it to obtain only single-valued wave functions is logically circular if the objective of stochastic mechanics is to derive quantum mechanics. The challenge then is to find a physically plausible justification for (27) strictly within the assumptions of existing formulations of stochastic mechanics, or otherwise some new formulation. Accordingly, we shall now begin the development of our proposed justification through a reformulation of Nelson-Yasue stochastic mechanics (NYSM).

4 Classical Model of Constrained Zitterbewegung Motion

Here we develop a classical model of a particle of mass m constrained in its rest frame to undergo a simple harmonic oscillation of (electron) Compton frequency, and show that it gives rise to a quantization condition equivalent to (27). Our model motivates the quantization condition from essentially the same physical arguments used by de Broglie in his "phase-wave" model [95, 96] and by Bohm in his subquantum field-theoretic models [97, 98]. However, it differs from both de Broglie's model and Bohm's models in that we do not need to refer to fictitious "phase waves", nor assume that our particle is some localized distribution of a (hypothetical) fluctuating subquantum field [97], nor assume a non-denumerable infinity of "local clocks" at each point in space-time [98]. We start by developing the free particle case, extend it to a classical Hamilton-Jacobi (HJ) statistical mechanical description, and repeat these steps with the inclusion of interactions with external fields.

The purpose of this section is three-fold: (i) to explicitly show, without the added conceptual complications of stochastic mechanics, the basic physical assumptions underlying our particle model; (ii) to show how our model can be consistently generalized to include interactions with external fields; (iii) to show, using a well-established formulation of classical statistical mechanics that has conceptual and mathematical similarities to stochastic mechanics, how our model can be consistently generalized to a statistical ensemble description (which will also be necessary in the stochastic mechanical case), and how doing so gives a quantization condition equivalent to (27) for a 'classical' wave function satisfying a nonlinear Schrödinger equation. No attempt will be made here to suggest a physical/dynamical model for the zitterbewegung motion. A framework for a physical model is given in section 5, while a discussion of possible physical models is reserved for Part II.

[14] This argument was relayed to the author by T. Wallstrom [private communication].

4.1 One free particle

Suppose that a classical particle of rest mass m is rheonomically constrained to undergo a periodic process with constant angular frequency, ω_0, about some fixed point in 3-space, $\mathbf{q}_0$, in a Lorentz frame where the particle has translational velocity $\mathbf{v} = d\mathbf{q}_0/dt = 0$. The exact nature of this process is not important for the argument that follows, as long as it is periodic. For example, this process could be an oscillation or (if the particle is spinning) a rotation. But since we are considering the spinless case, we will take the periodic process to be some kind of oscillation. The constancy of ω_0 implies that the oscillation is simply harmonic with phase $\theta = \omega_0 t_0 + \phi$. Although the assumption of simple harmonic motion implies that θ is a continuous function of the particle's position, in the translational rest frame, it must be the case that the phase change $\delta\theta$ at any fixed instant t_0 will be zero for some translational displacement $\delta\mathbf{q}_0$. Otherwise, such a displacement would define a preferred direction in space given by $\nabla\theta(\mathbf{q}_0)$. Hence, in the translational rest frame, we can write

$$\delta\theta = \omega_0 \delta t_0, \tag{30}$$

where δt_0 is the change in proper time.

If we Lorentz transform to the lab frame where the particle has constant translational velocity, $\mathbf{v}$, and undergoes a displacement $\delta\mathbf{q}(t)$ in δt, then $\delta t_0 = \gamma\left(\delta t - \mathbf{v}\cdot\delta\mathbf{q}(t)/c^2\right)$ and (30) becomes

$$\delta\theta(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \omega_0\gamma\left(\delta t - \frac{\mathbf{v}\cdot\delta\mathbf{q}(t)}{c^2}\right), \tag{31}$$

where $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{(1 - v^2/c^2)}$. Recalling that for a relativistic free particle we have $E = \gamma mc^2$ and $\mathbf{p} = \gamma m\mathbf{v}$, (31) can be equivalently expressed as

$$\delta\theta(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \frac{\omega_0}{mc^2}\left(E\delta t - \mathbf{p}\cdot\delta\mathbf{q}(t)\right). \tag{32}$$

Suppose now that the oscillating particle is physically or virtually [15] displaced around a closed loop L (i.e. a continuous, non-self-intersecting loop that is otherwise arbitrary) in which both position and time can vary. The consistency of the model requires that the accumulated phase change be given by

$$\oint_L \delta\theta(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \frac{\omega_0}{mc^2}\oint_L \left(E\delta t - \mathbf{p}\cdot\delta\mathbf{q}(t)\right) = 2\pi n, \tag{33}$$

where n is an integer. This follows from the assumption that the oscillation is simply harmonic in the particle's rest frame, which makes θ in the lab frame a single-valued function of $\mathbf{q}(t)$ (up to an additive integer multiple of 2π). Indeed, if (33) were not true, we would contradict our hypothesis that the oscillating particle has a well-defined phase at each point along its space-time trajectory.

If we further make the 'zitterbewegung' (zbw) hypothesis that $m = m_e = 9.11 \times 10^{-28} g$ and $\omega_0/m_e c^2 = 1/\hbar$ so that $\omega_0 = \omega_c = 7.77 \times 10^{20} rad/s$, which is the electron Compton angular frequency, then (33) can be rewritten as

$$\oint_L \delta S(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \oint_L \left(\mathbf{p}\cdot\delta\mathbf{q}(t) - E\delta t\right) = nh. \tag{34}$$

Finally, for the special case of loop integrals in which time is held fixed ($\delta t = 0$), (34) reduces to

$$\oint_L \delta S(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \oint_L \mathbf{p}\cdot\delta\mathbf{q}(t) = nh, \tag{35}$$

which we may observe is formally identical to the Bohr-Sommerfeld-Wilson quantization condition.

By integrating (32) and using the Legendre transformation, it can be shown that the phase of the free zbw particle is, equivalently, its relativistic action up to an additive constant, or $S(\mathbf{q}(t), t) =$

[15] Because we permit a virtual displacement where time changes, we cannot use the definition of a virtual displacement often found in textbooks [99, 100] (which assumes time is fixed under the displacement). Instead, we use the more refined definition of virtual displacements proposed by Ray & Shamanna [101], namely that a virtual displacement is the difference between any two (unequal) "allowed displacements", or $\delta\mathbf{q}_k = d\mathbf{q}_k - d\mathbf{q}_k^{'}$, where $k = 1, 2, ..., N$, and an allowed displacement is defined as $d\mathbf{q}_k = \mathbf{v}_k dt$, where $\mathbf{v}_k$ are the "virtual velocities", or the velocities allowed by the mechanical constraints of a given system.

$\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{q}(t)-Et-\hbar\phi = -mc^2\int dt/\gamma + C$. [16] Recognizing also that $\mathbf{p} = \hbar\gamma\omega_c\mathbf{v}/c^2 = \hbar\gamma\mathbf{k}$ and $E = \hbar\gamma\omega_c$, the translational 3-velocity of the particle can be obtained from $S(\mathbf{q}(t),t)$ as $\mathbf{v} = (1/\gamma m)\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}$, and the total relativistic energy as $E = -\partial_t S(\mathbf{q},t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}$. It follows then that $S(\mathbf{q}(t),t)$ is a solution of the classical relativistic Hamilton-Jacobi equation,

$$-\partial_t S(\mathbf{q},t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = \sqrt{m^2c^4 + \left(\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t)\right)^2 c^2}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}. \tag{36}$$

In the non-relativistic limit, $v \ll c$, $S(\mathbf{q}(t),t) \approx m\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{q}(t) - \left(mc^2 + \frac{mv^2}{2}\right)t - \hbar\phi$, and (36) becomes

$$-\partial_t S(\mathbf{q},t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = \frac{\left(\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t)\right)^2}{2m}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} + mc^2, \tag{37}$$

where $\mathbf{v} = (1/m)\,\nabla S|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = (1/m)\hbar\mathbf{k}$ and satisfies the trivial classical Newtonian equation

$$m\mathbf{a} = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla\right)\nabla S = 0. \tag{38}$$

We find then that, in the non-relativistic limit, the oscillation frequency of the *zbw* particle has two parts - a low frequency oscillation, $\omega_{dB} = \hbar k^2/2m$, which modulates the high frequency oscillation ω_c.

Evidently (37) has the form of the non-relativistic dispersion relation $E = \hbar^2k^2/2m + mc^2$, which naively suggests that one can obtain the free-particle Schrödinger equation for a plane wave by introducing operators $\hat{p} = -i\hbar\nabla$ and $\hat{E} = i\hbar\partial_t$ such that $\hat{p}\psi = \hbar k\psi$, $\hat{E}\psi = \hbar\omega\psi$, and $i\hbar\partial_t\psi = -\left(\hbar^2/2m\right)\nabla^2\psi$ for $\psi(\mathbf{q},t) = Ae^{i(\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{q}-Et)/\hbar}$. However, there is no physical wave for such a plane wave to be identified with in our model. Such a plane wave and Schrödinger equation are nothing more than abstract, mathematically equivalent re-writings of the *zbw* particle energy equation (37). On the other hand, as we will see next, a *nonlinear* Schrödinger equation that describes the dynamical evolution of a statistical ensemble of identical *zbw* particles is derivable from the classical HJ description of the ensemble.

4.2 Classical Hamilton-Jacobi statistical mechanics for one free particle

Suppose that the actual position and momentum of a *zbw* particle, $(\mathbf{q}(t),\mathbf{p}(t))$, are unknown. Then we must resort to the description of a classical (i.e., Gibbsian) statistical ensemble of fictitious, identical, non-interacting *zbw* particles [65], which differ from each other only by virtue of their initial positions, velocities, and (possibly) phases. (Consideration of this in the classical context will be helpful for seeing how our model can be incorporated into stochastic mechanics.) In terms of the *zbw* phase, this change in description corresponds to replacing $\delta S(\mathbf{q}(t),t)$ by $dS(\mathbf{q},t) = \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q},t)\cdot d\mathbf{q} - E(\mathbf{q},t)dt$, which we obtained from replacing $\mathbf{q}(t)$ by $\mathbf{q}$, where $\mathbf{q}$ labels a *possible* position in 3-D space that the actual *zbw* particle could occupy at time t. Integrating $dS(\mathbf{q},t)$ then gives $S(\mathbf{q},t) = \int\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q},t)d\mathbf{q} - \int E(\mathbf{q},t)dt + C$, where $C = \hbar\phi$ is just the initial phase constant. So $S(\mathbf{q},t)$ is a phase *field* over the ensemble, $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q},t) = \nabla S(\mathbf{q},t)$ is the corresponding translational momentum field, and $E(\mathbf{q},t) = -\partial_t S(\mathbf{q},t)$ is the total energy field. Note that, for any initial $\mathbf{q}$ and t, the constant ϕ can be given any value on the interval $[0,2\pi]$; i.e., the initial phase constant associated with any member of the ensemble can be freely specified on that interval. (Of course, this phase constant does not affect the momentum field or the total energy field, as these fields are obtained from space-time derivatives of the phase field. Thus there are many phase fields corresponding to a unique momentum field and total energy field.)

Now, in the specific case of the free *zbw* particle, $p = const$ and $E = const$ for each member of the ensemble. So the infinitesimal phase change over the ensemble is just $dS(\mathbf{q},t) = \mathbf{p}\cdot d\mathbf{q} - Edt$, yielding $S(\mathbf{q},t) = \mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{q} - Et + C$ upon integration.

With this phase field in hand, we can now construct a classical HJ statistical mechanics for our *zbw* particle. Essentially, $S(\mathbf{q},t)$ and $\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t)$ will respectively satisfy the classical Hamilton-Jacobi equation,

[16] The proof is as follows. From $L = -mc^2/\gamma$, the Legendre transform gives $E = \mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{v} - L = \gamma mv^2 + mc^2/\gamma = \gamma mc^2$ and $L = \mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{v} - E$. So for the free *zbw* particle, $S = \int Ldt + C = \int(\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{v} - E)\,dt + C = \int(\mathbf{p}\cdot d\mathbf{q} - Edt) + C = \mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{q} - Et + C$ (absorbing the integration constants arising from $d\mathbf{q}$ and dt into C).

$$-\partial_t S(\mathbf{q},t) = \frac{\left(\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t)\right)^2}{2m} + mc^2, \tag{39}$$

and the trivial classical Newtonian equation,

$$m\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q},t) = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q},t)\cdot\nabla\right)\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t) = 0. \tag{40}$$

If we now suppose that the density of ensemble particles per unit volume in an element d^3q surrounding the point $\mathbf{q}$ at time t is given by the function $\rho(\mathbf{q},t) \geq 0$, which satisfies the normalization condition $\int \rho_0(\mathbf{q})d^3q = 1$, then it is straightforward to show [65] that $\rho(\mathbf{q},t)$ evolves in time by the continuity equation

$$\frac{\partial\rho(\mathbf{q},t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla\cdot\left[\frac{\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t)}{m}\rho(\mathbf{q},t)\right]. \tag{41}$$

Accordingly, $\rho(\mathbf{q},t)$ carries the interpretation of the probability density for the actual *zbw* particle position $\mathbf{q}(t)$. Furthermore, since each ensemble particle is a *zbw* particle, $S(\mathbf{q},t)$ will be a single-valued function of $\mathbf{q}$ and t (up to an additive integer multiple of 2π), implying

$$\oint_L dS(\mathbf{q},t) = \oint_L \nabla S(\mathbf{q},t)\cdot d\mathbf{q} = nh. \tag{42}$$

The use of exact differentials in (42) indicates that the loop integral is now an integral of the momentum field along any closed *mathematical* loop in 3-space with time held constant; that is, a closed loop around which the actual particle with momentum $\mathbf{p}$ *could potentially be displaced*, starting from any possible position $\mathbf{q}$ it can occupy at fixed time t. This tells us that the circulation of the momentum field over the ensemble is quantized, in contrast to an ordinary classical statistical mechanical ensemble for which the momentum field circulation need not satisfy (42).

Finally, we can combine (39) and (41) into the nonlinear Schrödinger equation [78, 79, 65, 80, 81, 82],

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\psi(\mathbf{q},t)}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\nabla^2\psi(\mathbf{q},t) + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\frac{\nabla^2|\psi(\mathbf{q},t)|}{|\psi(\mathbf{q},t)|}\psi(\mathbf{q},t) + mc^2\psi(\mathbf{q},t), \tag{43}$$

with general solution $\psi(\mathbf{q},t) = \sqrt{\rho_0(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{v}_0 t)}e^{iS(\mathbf{q},t)/\hbar}$, which is single-valued because of (42). (Note that C will contribute a global phase factor, $e^{iC/\hbar}$, which cancels out from both sides.) As an example of a specific solution, the complex phase $e^{iS/\hbar}$ takes the form of a plane-wave, $S = \mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{q} - Et + \hbar\phi$, while the initial probability density, ρ_0, can take the form of a Gaussian that propagates with fixed profile and speed v (in contrast to a Gaussian density in free particle quantum mechanics, which disperses over time).

We have thereby shown that extending our free *zbw* particle model to a classical HJ statistical mechanics allows us to derive a nonlinear Schrödinger equation with single-valued wave functions. Next we will incorporate interactions of the *zbw* particle with external fields.

4.3 One particle interacting with external fields

To describe the interaction of our *zbw* particle with fields, let us reconsider the change in the *zbw* phase in the rest frame. In terms of the rest energy of the *zbw* particle, we can rewrite (30) as

$$\delta\theta = \omega_c\delta t_0 = \frac{1}{\hbar}\left(mc^2\right)\delta t_0. \tag{44}$$

Any additional contribution to the energy of the particle, such as from a weak external gravitational field (e.g. the Earth's gravitational field) coupling to the particle's mass m via $\Phi_g = \mathbf{g}\cdot\mathbf{q}$, will then modify (44) as

$$\delta\theta = \left(\omega_c + \kappa(\mathbf{q})\right)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}_0}\delta t_0 = \frac{1}{\hbar}\left(mc^2 + m\Phi_g(\mathbf{q})\right)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}_0}\delta t_0, \tag{45}$$

where $\kappa = \omega_c \Phi_g / c^2$. In other words, the gravitational field shifts the *zbw* frequency in the rest frame by a very small amount. For example, if $|\mathbf{g}| = 10^3 cm/s^2$ and is in the $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ direction, and we take $|\mathbf{q}| = 100cm$, then $\kappa \approx \omega_c \times 10^{-16}$. Here we have approximated the point at which the *zbw* particle interacts with the external gravitational field to be just its equilibrium position, $\mathbf{q}_0$, because the displacement $|\mathbf{q}| \gg \lambda_c$, allowing us to approximate the interaction with the mass as point-like. [17]

In addition, we could allow the *zbw* particle to carry charge e (so that it now becomes a classical charged oscillator, subject to the hypothetical constraint that it does not radiate electromagnetic energy in its rest frame, or the constraint that the oscillation of the charge is radially symmetric so that there is no net energy radiated [102, 103, 104], or constrained to correspond to one of the non-spherically-symmetric charge distributions considered by Bohm and Weinstein [105] for which the retarded self-fields cause the charge distribution to oscillate at a fixed frequency without radiating) which couples to an external (and possibly space-time varying) electric field such that $\Phi_e = \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{q}, t) \cdot \mathbf{q}$, where $\mathbf{q}$ is the displacement vector in some arbitrary direction from the field source. Here again we can make the point-like approximation, as in laboratory experiments the displacement of a particle from a field source is typically on the centimeter scale, making $|\mathbf{q}| \gg \lambda_c$). Then

$$\delta\theta = (\omega_c + \kappa(\mathbf{q}_0) + \varepsilon(\mathbf{q}_0, t_0))\, \delta t_0 = \frac{1}{\hbar} \left(mc^2 + m\Phi_g(\mathbf{q}_0) + e\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}_0, t_0) \right) \delta t_0, \tag{46}$$

where $\varepsilon = \omega_c \left(e/mc^2 \right) \Phi_e$. Assuming $\mathbf{E}$ has an experimental value of $\sim 10^5 V/cm \approx .03 statV/cm$, which is the upper limit laboratory field strength that can be produced in Stark effect experiments [106], and $|\mathbf{q}| = 1cm$, then $\varepsilon \approx \omega_c \times 10^{-5}$, which is also a very small shift.

If we now transform to the laboratory frame where the *zbw* particle has nonzero but variable translational velocity, (46) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\theta(\mathbf{q}(t), t) &= \left[(\omega_{dB} + \kappa(\mathbf{q}) + \varepsilon(\mathbf{q}))\, \gamma \left(\delta t - \frac{\mathbf{v}_0(\mathbf{q}, t) \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}}{c^2} \right) \right]_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} \\
&= \frac{1}{\hbar} \left[\left(\gamma mc^2 + \gamma m\Phi_g(\mathbf{q}) + e\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}, t) \right) \delta t - \left(\gamma mc^2 + \gamma m\Phi_g(\mathbf{q}) + e\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}, t) \right) \frac{\mathbf{v}_0(\mathbf{q}, t) \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}}{c^2} \right] |_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} \\
&= \frac{1}{\hbar} \left(E(\mathbf{q}(t), t)\delta t - \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t) \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

where $E = \gamma mc^2 + \gamma m\Phi_g + e\Phi_e$ and $\mathbf{p} = m\mathbf{v} = \left(\gamma mc^2 + \gamma m\Phi_g + e\Phi_e \right) \left(\mathbf{v}_0 / c^2 \right)$. (Note that the term $e\Phi_e$ is unaffected by the Lorentz transformation because it doesn't involve the particle's rest mass.) Here the velocity $\mathbf{v}_0$ is that of a free particle, while $\mathbf{v}$ is the adjusted velocity due to the presence of external potentials. In this moving frame, we can also have the *zbw* particle couple to an external magnetic vector potential [18] such that $\mathbf{v} \to \mathbf{v}' = \mathbf{v} + e\mathbf{A}_{ext}/\gamma mc$ (and γ depends on v). Although the physical influence of the fields now allows the ω and $\mathbf{k}$ of the particle to vary as a function of position and time, the phase of the oscillation is still a well-defined function of the particle's space-time location; so if we displace the oscillating particle around a closed loop, the phase change is still given by

$$\oint_L \delta\theta(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \frac{1}{\hbar} \oint_L \left(E(\mathbf{q}(t), t)\delta t - \mathbf{p}'(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t) \right) = 2\pi n, \tag{48}$$

or

$$\oint_L \delta S(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \oint_L \left(\mathbf{p}'(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t) - E(\mathbf{q}(t), t)\delta t \right) = nh. \tag{49}$$

For the special case of a loop in which time is held fixed, we then have

$$\oint_L \delta S(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \oint_L \nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t) = \oint_L \mathbf{p}'(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t) = nh, \tag{50}$$

[17] This appears to be the same assumption made by de Broglie for his equivalent model, although he never explicitly says so. Bohm, to the best of our knowledge, never extended his models to include field interactions.

[18] We could of course also include a gravitational vector potential, but for simplicity we'll just stick with the magnetic version.

or

$$\oint_L m\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}(t),t)\cdot\delta\mathbf{q}(t) = nh - \frac{e}{c}\oint_L \mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}(t),t)\cdot\delta\mathbf{q}(t), \tag{51}$$

where the last term on the r.h.s. of (51) is, by Stokes' theorem, the magnetic flux enclosed by the loop.

We can also integrate (47) and rewrite in terms of $S(\mathbf{q}(t),t)$ to obtain

$$S(\mathbf{q}(t),t) = \int dS(\mathbf{q}(t),t) = \int (\mathbf{p}'(\mathbf{q}(t),t)\cdot d\mathbf{q}(t) - E(\mathbf{q}(t),t)dt) - \hbar\phi, \tag{52}$$

where ϕ is the initial phase constant and (52) is equivalent (up to an additive constant) to the relativistic action of a particle in the presence of external fields. [19] As before, the translational kinetic 3-velocity of the particle can be obtained from $S(\mathbf{q}(t),t)$ as $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}(t),t) = \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q}(t),t)/\gamma m = (1/\gamma m)\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} - e\mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}(t),t)/\gamma mc$, and the total relativistic energy as $E(\mathbf{q}(t),t) = -\partial_t S(\mathbf{q},t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}$. It then follows that $S(\mathbf{q}(t),t)$ is a solution of the classical relativistic Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$-\partial_t S(\mathbf{q},t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = \sqrt{m^2c^4 + \left(\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t) - \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q},t)\right)^2 c^2}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} + \gamma m\Phi_g(\mathbf{q}(t)) + e\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}(t),t). \tag{53}$$

When $v \ll c$,

$$\begin{aligned} S(\mathbf{q}(t),t) \approx & \int m\mathbf{v}'(\mathbf{q}(t))\cdot d\mathbf{q}(t) - \\ & - \int \left(mc^2 + \frac{1}{2m}\left[\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q}(t),t) - \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}(t),t)\right]^2 + m\Phi_g(\mathbf{q}(t)) + e\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}(t),t)\right) dt - \hbar\phi, \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

and (53) becomes

$$-\partial_t S(\mathbf{q},t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = \frac{\left(\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t) - \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q},t)\right)^2}{2m}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} + mc^2 + m\Phi_g(\mathbf{q}(t)) + e\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}(t),t), \tag{55}$$

with $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}(t),t) = (1/m)\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} - e\mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}(t),t)/mc$ and satisfies the classical Newtonian equation of motion,

$$\begin{aligned} m\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}(t),t) &= \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}(t),t)\cdot\nabla\right)\left[\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t) - \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q},t)\right]|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} \\ &= -\nabla\left[m\Phi_g(\mathbf{q}) + e\Phi_e(\mathbf{q},t)\right]|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} - \frac{e}{c}\frac{\partial\mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q},t)}{\partial t}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} + \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}(t),t)\times\mathbf{B}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}(t),t). \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

Incidentally, if we choose Φ_e as the Coulomb potential for the hydrogen atom and set $\mathbf{B}_{ext} = 0$, then our model is empirically equivalent to the Bohr model of the hydrogen atom (the demonstration of this can be found in Appendix B). As in the previous section, we now want to extend our model to a classical HJ statistical mechanics.

4.4 Classical Hamilton-Jacobi statistical mechanics for one particle interacting with external fields

Suppose now that, in the $v \ll c$ approximated lab frame, we do not know the actual position $\mathbf{q}(t)$ of the *zbw* particle. Then the phase (54) becomes a field over a statistical ensemble of *zbw* particles, or

[19] The proof is as follows. From $L = -mc^2/\gamma - \gamma m\Phi_g - e\Phi_e + e\frac{\mathbf{v}}{\mathbf{c}}\cdot\mathbf{A}_{ext}$, the Legendre transform gives $E = \mathbf{p}'\cdot\mathbf{v} - L = \gamma mv^2 + mc^2/\gamma + \gamma m\Phi_g + e\Phi_e = \gamma mc^2 + \gamma m\Phi_g + e\Phi_e$ and $L = \mathbf{p}'\cdot\mathbf{v} - E$. So, $S = \int Ldt + C = \int(\mathbf{p}'\cdot\mathbf{v} - E)\,dt + C = \int(\mathbf{p}'\cdot d\mathbf{q} - Edt) + C$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
S(\mathbf{q},t) = & \int m\mathbf{v}'(\mathbf{q},t)\cdot d\mathbf{q} \\
& - \int \left(mc^2 + \frac{1}{2m}\left[\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q},t) - \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q},t)\right]^2 + m\Phi_g(\mathbf{q}) + e\Phi_c(\mathbf{q},t)\right) dt - \hbar\phi.
\end{aligned}
\tag{57}
$$

To obtain the equations of motion for $S(\mathbf{q},t)$ and $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q},t)$ we will apply the classical analogue of Yasue's variational principle, in anticipation of the method we will use for constructing ZSM.

First we introduce the ensemble-averaged phase (inputting limits between initial and final states),

$$
\begin{aligned}
J(\mathbf{q}) &= \int d^3q\rho(\mathbf{q},t)\left[\int_{q_i}^{q_f} m\mathbf{v}'\cdot d\mathbf{q}(t) - \int_{t_i}^{t_f}\left(mc^2 + \frac{1}{2m}\left[\mathbf{p} - \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}_{ext}\right]^2 + m\Phi_g + e\Phi_e\right)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}dt - \hbar\phi\right] \\
&= \int d^3q\rho\int_{t_i}^{t_f}\left\{\frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{v}^2 + \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}_{ext}\cdot\mathbf{v} - mc^2 - m\Phi_g - e\Phi_e\right\}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}dt - \hbar\phi,
\end{aligned}
\tag{58}
$$

where the equated expressions are related by the usual Legendre transformation. Imposing the variational constraint,

$$
J(\mathbf{q}) = extremal, \tag{59}
$$

a straightfoward computation exactly along the lines of that in Appendix A yields (56), which, upon replacing $\mathbf{q}(t)$ by $\mathbf{q}$, corresponds to the classical Newtonian equation,

$$
\begin{aligned}
m\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q},t) &= \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q},t)\cdot\nabla\right)\left[\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t) - \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q},t)\right] \\
&= -\nabla\left[m\Phi_g(\mathbf{q}) + e\Phi_e(\mathbf{q},t)\right] - \frac{e}{c}\frac{\partial\mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q},t)}{\partial t} + \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q},t)\times\mathbf{B}_{ext}(\mathbf{q},t),
\end{aligned}
\tag{60}
$$

where $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q},t) = (1/m)\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t) - e\mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q},t)/mc$ corresponds to the kinetic velocity field over the ensemble. By integrating both sides and setting the integration constant equal to the rest mass, we then obtain the classical Hamilton-Jacobi equation for (57),

$$
-\partial_t S(\mathbf{q},t) = \frac{\left(\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t) - \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q},t)\right)^2}{2m} + mc^2 + m\Phi_g(\mathbf{q}) + e\Phi_e(\mathbf{q},t). \tag{61}
$$

Because the momentum field couples to the vector potential, it can be readily shown that $\rho(\mathbf{q},t)$ now evolves by the modified continuity equation

$$
\frac{\partial\rho(\mathbf{q},t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla\cdot\left[\left(\frac{\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t)}{m} - \frac{e}{mc}\mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q},t)\right)\rho(\mathbf{q},t)\right], \tag{62}
$$

which preserves the normalization, $\int\rho_0(\mathbf{q})d^3q = 1$. As before, each ensemble particle is a *zbw* particle so that the phase $S(\mathbf{q},t)$ is a single-valued function of $\mathbf{q}$ and t (up to an additive integer multiple of 2π), giving

$$
\oint_L \nabla S(\mathbf{q},t)\cdot d\mathbf{q} = nh. \tag{63}
$$

Finally, we can combined (61) and (62) into the nonlinear Schrödinger equation,

$$
i\hbar\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = \frac{\left[-i\hbar\nabla - \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}_{ext}\right]^2}{2m}\psi + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\frac{\nabla^2|\psi|}{|\psi|}\psi + m\Phi_g\psi + e\Phi_e\psi + mc^2\psi, \tag{64}
$$

with wave function $\psi(\mathbf{q},t) = \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q},t)}e^{iS(\mathbf{q},t)/\hbar}$, which is single-valued because of (63). (Again, C will contribute a global phase $e^{iC/\hbar}$ which drops out.)

5 Zitterbewegung Stochastic Mechanics

We are now ready to extend the classical *zbw* model developed in section 4 to Nelson-Yasue stochastic mechanics for all the same cases. In doing so, we will show how this 'zitterbewegung stochastic mechanics' (ZSM) avoids the Wallstrom criticism and explain the 'quantum-classical correspondence' between the ZSM equations and the classical HJ statistical mechanical equations. We will also apply ZSM to the central potential problem considered by Wallstrom, to demonstrate how angular momentum quantization emerges and therefore that the solution space of ZSM's HJM equations is equivalent to the solution space of the quantum mechanical Schrödinger equation.

5.1 One free particle

As in NYSM, we take as our starting point that a particle of rest mass m and 3-space coordinate $\mathbf{q}(t)$ is immersed in Nelson's hypothesized ether and undergoes a conservative diffusion process according to the stochastic differential equations,

$$d\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)dt + d\mathbf{W}(t), \tag{65}$$

and

$$d\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t)dt + d\mathbf{W}_*(t), \tag{66}$$

where (66) is the backwards-in-time version of (65), and $d\mathbf{W}$ is the Wiener process satisfying $E_t\left[d\mathbf{W}\right] = 0$ and $E_t\left[d\mathbf{W}^2\right] = (\hbar/m)\, dt$. However, in order to incorporate the *zbw* oscillation as a property of the particle, we must now amend Nelson's original phenomenological hypotheses about his ether and particle with the following additional hypotheses of phenomenological character: [20]

1. Nelson's ether is not only a stochastically fluctuating medium in space-time, but an oscillating medium with a spectrum of mean angular frequencies superposed at each point in 3-space. More precisely, we imagine the ether as a continuous (or effectively continuous) medium composed of a countably infinite number of fluctuating, stationary, spherical waves [21] superposed at each point in space, with each wave having a different (constant) mean angular frequency, ω_0^i, where i denotes the i-th ether mode. (If we assume an upper frequency cut-off for our modes as the inverse Planck time, this will imply an upper bound on the Compton frequency of an elementary particle immersed in the ether, as we will see from hypothesis 3 below.) The relative phases between the modes are taken to be random so that each mode is effectively uncorrelated with every other mode.

2. The particle of rest mass m, located in its instantaneous mean translational rest frame (IMTRF), i.e., the frame in which $D\mathbf{q}(t) = D_*\mathbf{q}(t) = 0$, at some point $\mathbf{q}_0$, is bounded to a harmonic oscillator potential with fixed natural frequency $\omega_0 = \omega_c = (1/\hbar)\, mc^2$. In keeping with the phenomenological approach of ZSM and the approach taken by de Broglie and Bohm with their *zbw* models, we need not specify the precise physical nature of this harmonic oscillator potential. This is task is left for a future physical model of the ZSM particle.

3. The particle's center of mass, as a result of being immersed in the ether, undergoes an approximately frictionless translational Brownian motion (due to the homogeneous and isotropic ether fluctuations that couple to the particle by possibly electromagnetic, gravitational, or some other means); and, in its IMTRF, undergoes a driven oscillation about $\mathbf{q}_0$ by coupling to a narrow band of ether modes that resonantly peaks around the particle's natural frequency. However, in order that the oscillation of the particle doesn't become unbounded in its kinetic energy, there must be some mechanism by which the particle dissipates energy back into the ether modes so

[20] Meaning, we will follow Nelson's approach of provisionally not offering an explicit physical model of the ether, and de Broglie-Bohm's approach of provisionally not offering an explicit physical model for the *zbw* particle, beyond the hypothetical characteristics listed here. However, these characteristics should be regarded as general constraints on any future physical model of Nelson's ether, the *zbw* particle, and the dynamical coupling between the two.

[21] These ether waves could be fundamentally continuous field variables, or perhaps collective modes arising from nonlinear coupling between (hypothetical) discrete constituents of the ether. Both possibilities are logically compatible with what follows.

that, on the average, a steady-state equilibrium regime is reached for the oscillation. That is to say, on some hypothetical characteristic short time-scale, τ, the mean energy absorbed from the driven oscillation by the resonant ether modes equals the mean energy dissipated back to the ether by the particle. (In keeping with our phenomenological approach, we will not propose a specific mechanism for this energy exchange, only provisionally assume that it occurs somehow.) Accordingly, we suppose that, in this steady-state regime, the particle undergoes a constant mean *zbw* oscillation about $\mathbf{q}_0$ in its IMTRF, as characterized by the "fluctuation-dissipation" relation, $< H >_{steady-state} = \hbar\omega_c = mc^2$, where $< H >_{steady-state}$ is the conserved mean energy due to the steady-state oscillation.

It follows then that, in the IMTRF, the mean *zbw* phase change is given by

$$\delta\bar{\theta} = \omega_c \delta t_0 = \frac{mc^2}{\hbar}\delta t_0, \tag{67}$$

and the corresponding absolute mean phase is

$$\bar{\theta} = \omega_c t_0 + \phi = \frac{mc^2}{\hbar} t_0 + \phi. \tag{68}$$

It is interesting to observe now that, in this construction, both the diffusion coefficient $\nu = \hbar/2m$, and the (reduced) *zbw* period $T_c = 1/\omega_c = \hbar/mc^2$, are scaled by $\hbar$. This reflects the fact that the ether is hypothesized to be the common physical cause of both the conservative diffusion process and the conservative *zbw* oscillation. Had we not proposed Nelson's ether as the physical cause of the *zbw* oscillation as well as the conservative diffusion process, the occurrence of $\hbar$ in both of these particle properties would be inexplicable and compromising for the plausibility of our proposed modification of NYSM.

It should be stressed here that it is not possible to talk of the *zbw* phase other than in the IMTRF of the particle, as we cannot transform to a frame in which $d\mathbf{q}(t)/dt = 0$, since such an expression is undefined for the (non-differentiable) Wiener process.

Now, suppose we Lorentz transform back into the lab frame where

$$D\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \neq 0, \tag{69}$$

and

$$D_*\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \neq 0. \tag{70}$$

Approximating the transformation for non-relativistic velocities so that $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{(1 - b^2/c^2)} \approx 1 + b^2/2c^2$, we see that the mean forward *zbw* phase change becomes

$$\delta\bar{\theta}_+(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2}\left[E_+(\mathbf{q}(t), t)\delta t - m\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t)\right], \tag{71}$$

while the mean backward phase change becomes

$$\delta\bar{\theta}_-(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2}\left[E_-(\mathbf{q}(t), t)\delta t - m\mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t)\right], \tag{72}$$

where, without any time-symmetric dynamical constraints on the stochastic process,

$$E_+(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = mc^2 + \frac{1}{2}mb^2, \tag{73}$$

and

$$E_-(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = mc^2 + \frac{1}{2}mb_*^2, \tag{74}$$

neglecting the momentum term proportional to b^3/c^2. The mean forward and backward *zbw* phase changes, (71) and (72), must, of course, each equal $2\pi n$ when integrated along a closed loop in which both time and position change, or a closed loop with time held constant; otherwise we will contradict the hypothesis that the Nelsonian *zbw* particle has a well-defined mean forward and backward phase at each point along its mean forward/backward space-time trajectory.

In the lab frame, the forward and backward stochastic differential equations for the translational motion are as before,

$$d\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)dt + d\mathbf{W}(t), \tag{75}$$

and

$$d\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t)dt + d\mathbf{W}_*(t), \tag{76}$$

with corresponding Fokker-Planck equations

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot [\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}, t)\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)] + \frac{\hbar}{2m}\nabla^2 \rho(\mathbf{q}, t), \tag{77}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot [\mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}, t)\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)] - \frac{\hbar}{2m}\nabla^2 \rho(\mathbf{q}, t). \tag{78}$$

Thus far, the diffusion process we've considered is time-asymmetric. If we follow Nelson and impose the time-symmetric kinematic constraints,

$$\mathbf{v} = \frac{1}{2}\left[\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{b}_*\right] = \frac{\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)}{m}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}, \tag{79}$$

and

$$\mathbf{u} = \frac{1}{2}\left[\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}_*\right] = \frac{\hbar}{2m}\frac{\nabla \rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}, \tag{80}$$

then the Fokker-Planck equations (77) and (78) reduce to

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot \left[\frac{\nabla S(\mathbf{q}, t)}{m}\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)\right], \tag{81}$$

with $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{b}_* = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}$. We also follow Nelson in postulating the presence of an external osmotic potential $U(\mathbf{q}, t)$ which couples to the zbw particle as $R(\mathbf{q}, t) = \mu U(\mathbf{q}, t)$, thereby imparting an osmotic velocity $\nabla R/m = (\hbar/2m)\,\nabla\rho/\rho$. We then have $\rho = e^{2R/\hbar}$ for all times.

To obtain the time-symmetric mean dynamics for the translational motion, we use the variational principle of Yasue. Starting from the mean lab frame, if we integrate the time-asymmetric particle phases (71) and (72), and then average the two, we obtain

$$\bar{\theta}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2}\left[\int E(\mathbf{q}(t), t)dt - \int \frac{m}{2}\left(\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) + \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t)\right) \cdot d\mathbf{q}(t)\right] + \phi, \tag{82}$$

where, using the kinematic constraints (79) and (80), we have

$$E(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = mc^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{1}{2}mb^2 + \frac{1}{2}mb_*^2\right] = mc^2 + \frac{1}{2}mv^2 + \frac{1}{2}mu^2. \tag{83}$$

Then the ensemble-averaged, time-symmetric particle phase is given by (putting in integration limits between initial and final states),

$$\begin{aligned} J(\mathbf{q}) = \int d^3q\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)\bar{\theta}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2}\int d^3q\rho\left[\int_{t_i}^{t_f} E_{avg}dt - \int_{q_i}^{q_f} m\mathbf{v} \cdot d\mathbf{q}(t)\right] + \int d^3q\rho\phi \\ &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2}\left(\int_{t_i}^{t_f} < E_{avg} > dt - \int_{q_i}^{q_f} < \mathbf{p} \cdot d\mathbf{q}(t) >\right) + \phi. \end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

which we can see by the time-symmetric mean Legendre transformation, [22]

$$L = \frac{1}{2}\left[(m\mathbf{b}) \cdot \mathbf{b} + (m\mathbf{b}_*) \cdot \mathbf{b}_*\right] - \frac{1}{2}\left(E_+ + E_-\right) = (m\mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbf{v} + (m\mathbf{u}) \cdot \mathbf{u} - E, \tag{85}$$

[22] The time-symmetric mean Legendre transformation corresponds to taking the Legendre transforms of the forward and backward Lagrangians, respectively, and then taking the equal-weighted average of the Legendre transformed forward and backward Lagrangians.

and using that recalling that $\bar{\theta} = -\frac{1}{\hbar}S$, is equivalent to Eq. (19) in section 2. Applying the conservative diffusion constraint through the variational principle implies that the ensemble-averaged time-symmetric phase (which is, of course, equivalent to the ensemble-averaged time-symmetric action by a change of sign and multiplication by $\hbar$) is extremal, or

$$J(\mathbf{q}) = extremal. \tag{86}$$

A straightforward computation shows that this yields Nelson's mean acceleration equation,

$$m\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q}(t),t) = \frac{m}{2}\left[D_*D + DD_*\right]\mathbf{q}(t) = 0. \tag{87}$$

We can now see that the evolution equation for the time-symmetric mean phase (82), under the conservative diffusion constraint (86), will just be the integrated form of (87). Note, also, that from (79) and (82), we can make the identification

$$\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q}(t),t) = -\hbar\nabla\bar{\theta}(\mathbf{q},t)|_{q=q(t)} = \nabla S(\mathbf{q},t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}, \tag{88}$$

which establishes the Nelsonian current velocity as the translational velocity component of (82), and the velocity potential S as the mean phase of the *zbw* particle undergoing the conservative diffusion process. Computing the derivatives in (87), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} m\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{q},t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} &= m\left[\frac{\partial\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q},t)}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q},t)\cdot\nabla\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q},t) - \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{q},t)\cdot\nabla\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{q},t) - \frac{\hbar}{2m}\nabla^2\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{q},t)\right]|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} \\ &= \nabla\left[\frac{\partial S(\mathbf{q},t)}{\partial t} + \frac{\left(\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t)\right)^2}{2m} - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\frac{\nabla^2\sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q},t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q},t)}}\right]|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

which, upon replacing $\mathbf{q}(t)$ by $\mathbf{q}$ and integrating both sides, gives the total translational energy of the *zbw* particle as

$$E(\mathbf{q}(t),t) = -\frac{\partial S(\mathbf{q},t)}{\partial t}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = mc^2 + \frac{\left(\nabla S(\mathbf{q},t)\right)^2}{2m}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\frac{\nabla^2\sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q},t)}}{\sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q},t)}}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}, \tag{90}$$

where we have set the integration constant equal to the particle rest energy. The general solution of (90), i.e., the mean phase of the *zbw* particle in the time-symmetric mean lab frame (or the frame in which only the current velocity of the *zbw* particle is present), is clearly of the form

$$S(\mathbf{q}(t),t) = \int \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{q}(t),t)\cdot d\mathbf{q}(t) - \int E(\mathbf{q}(t),t)dt - \hbar\phi. \tag{91}$$

Notice that the dynamics for (91) differs from the dynamics of the classical *zbw* particle phase by the presence of the quantum kinetic which enters into (89). The two phases might appear to be connected by the 'classical limit' $(\hbar/2m) \to 0$, but this is only a formal connection since such a limit corresponds to deleting the presence of the ether, thereby also deleting the physical mechanism that we hypothesize to cause the *zbw* particle to oscillate at its Compton frequency. The physically realistic 'classical limit' for (90) corresponds to situations where the quantum kinetic and quantum force are negligible. Such situations will arise (as in the dBB theory) whenever the center of mass of a system of particles is sufficiently large and environmental decoherence is appreciable [107, 108, 109].

Now consider the particle phase change in the time-symmetric mean rest and lab frames. As in the classical *zbw* model, the *zbw* oscillation in the time-symmetric IMTRF is simply harmonic, making the time-symmetric mean phase a single-valued function (up to addition of an integer multiple of 2π) of the time-symmetric mean particle trajectory in the lab frame. Otherwise, we would contradict our hypothesis that the particle has a well-defined mean phase at each point in space that it can occupy. So if, in the time-symmetric IMTRF, we integrate the phase of the *zbw* particle around a closed loop L with $\delta t = 0$, we will have

$$\oint_L \delta S(\mathbf{q}(t),t) = \oint_L \mathbf{p}\cdot\delta\mathbf{q}(t) = nh. \tag{92}$$

If we also consider the *zbw* phase field, $S(\mathbf{q},t)$, which is a function over a statistical ensemble of *zbw* particles (as described in section 4.2), then by the same physical reasoning applied to each member of the ensemble, the net phase change along any mathematical loop in space (with time held fixed) will be

$$\oint_L dS(\mathbf{q},t) = \oint_L \mathbf{p}\cdot d\mathbf{q} = nh. \tag{93}$$

(The justification for (93) where $\rho = 0$ is discussed in section 5.2, since such "nodal points" typically arise in the presence of bound states.) The total energy field over the ensemble will correspondingly be given by (90) when $\mathbf{q}(t)$ is replaced by $\mathbf{q}$. So with (93), (90), and (81), we can construct the 1-particle Schrödinger equation,

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\psi(\mathbf{q},t)}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\nabla^2\psi(\mathbf{q},t) + mc^2\psi(\mathbf{q},t), \tag{94}$$

where $\psi(\mathbf{q},t) = \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q},t)}e^{iS(\mathbf{q},t)/\hbar}$ is a single-valued wave function as a result of (93). As in the classical case, the constant $C = \hbar\phi$ will contribute a global phase factor $e^{iC/\hbar}$ which cancels out from both sides of (94). We thereby have a formulation of free-particle ZSM that recovers the usual free-particle Schrödinger equation.

5.2 One particle interacting with external fields

Suppose again that the particle undergoes a mean *zbw* oscillation in its IMTRF, but now carries charge e so that it is a classical charged harmonic oscillator of some type (subject again to the hypothetical constraint of no electromagnetic radiation emitted when there is no translational motion; or the constraint that the oscillation of the charge is radially symmetric so that there is no net energy radiated; or, if the ether turns out to be electromagnetic in nature as Nelson suggested [4], then that the steady-state *zbw* oscillation is due to a balancing between the time-averaged electromagnetic energy absorbed via the driven oscillation of the particle's charge, and the time-averaged electromagnetic energy radiated back to the ether). Then, in the presence of an external electric potential, $\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}_0,t) = \mathbf{E}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}_0,t)\cdot\mathbf{q}_0$, where $\mathbf{q}_0$ is the displacement in some arbitrary direction from the field source (again making the point-like approximation for $|\mathbf{q}_0| \gg \lambda_c$), the mean *zbw* phase change in this IMTRF is shifted by

$$\delta\bar{\theta} = (\omega_c + \varepsilon(\mathbf{q}_0,t_0))\,\delta t_0 = \frac{1}{\hbar}\left(mc^2 + e\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}_0,t_0)\right)\delta t_0, \tag{95}$$

where $\varepsilon(\mathbf{q}_0,t_0) = \omega_c\left(e/mc^2\right)\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}_0,t_0)$. Direct integration gives the absolute mean phase as

$$\bar{\theta} = \int(\omega_c + \varepsilon(\mathbf{q}_0,t_0))\,dt_0 = \frac{1}{\hbar}\left(mc^2t_0 + e\int\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}_0,t_0)dt_0\right) + \phi. \tag{96}$$

If we now Lorentz transform back to the mean translational lab frame where

$$D\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t),t) \neq 0, \tag{97}$$

and

$$D_*\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t),t) \neq 0, \tag{98}$$

and approximate the transformation for non-relativistic velocities so that $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{(1-b^2/c^2)} \approx 1 + b^2/2c^2$, the mean *zbw* phase change forwards in time becomes

$$\delta\bar{\theta}_+(\mathbf{q}(t),t) = \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2}\left[E_+(\mathbf{q}(t),t)\delta t - m\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t),t)\cdot\delta\mathbf{q}(t)\right], \tag{99}$$

while the phase change backwards in time becomes

$$\delta\bar{\theta}_-(\mathbf{q}(t),t) = \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2}\left[E_-(\mathbf{q}(t),t)\delta t - m\mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t),t)\cdot\delta\mathbf{q}(t)\right], \tag{100}$$

where, without any time-symmetric dynamical constraints on the stochastic process,

$$E_+(\mathbf{q}(t),t) = mc^2 + \frac{1}{2}mb^2 + e\Phi_e, \tag{101}$$

and

$$E_-(\mathbf{q}(t),t) = mc^2 + \frac{1}{2}mb_*^2 + e\Phi_e, \tag{102}$$

neglecting the momentum term proportional to b^3/c^2. As in the free particle case, the mean forward and backward *zbw* phase changes, (99) and (100), must each equal $2\pi n$ when integrated along a closed loop L for which both time and position change, or a closed loop with time held constant, in order to be consistent with our hypothesis that the *zbw* particle has a well-defined mean forward and backward phase at each point in its mean forward/backward space-time trajectory. In the stochastic translational lab frame, the forward and backward stochastic differential equations for the translational motion are just

$$d\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t),t) + d\mathbf{W}(t), \tag{103}$$

and

$$d\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t),t) + d\mathbf{W}_*(t), \tag{104}$$

with corresponding Fokker-Planck equations

$$\frac{\partial\rho(\mathbf{q},t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla\cdot[\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q},t)\rho(\mathbf{q},t)] + \frac{\hbar}{2m}\nabla^2\rho(\mathbf{q},t), \tag{105}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial\rho(\mathbf{q},t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla\cdot[\mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q},t)\rho(\mathbf{q},t)] - \frac{\hbar}{2m}\nabla^2\rho(\mathbf{q},t). \tag{106}$$

Let us now suppose that an external magnetic field $\mathbf{B}_{ext}(\mathbf{q},t) = \nabla\times\mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q},t)$ is also present. Then the time-symmetric kinematic constraints become,

$$\mathbf{v} = \frac{1}{2}[\mathbf{b}+\mathbf{b}_*] = \frac{\nabla S}{m} - \frac{e}{mc}\mathbf{A}_{ext}, \tag{107}$$

and

$$\mathbf{u} = \frac{1}{2}[\mathbf{b}-\mathbf{b}_*] = \frac{\hbar}{2m}\frac{\nabla\rho}{\rho}. \tag{108}$$

Consequently, the Fokker-Planck equations (105) and (106) reduce to

$$\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t} = -\nabla\cdot\left[\left(\frac{\nabla S}{m} - \frac{e}{mc}\mathbf{A}_{ext}\right)\rho\right]. \tag{109}$$

We can then write $\mathbf{b}' = \mathbf{v}'+\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{b}'_* = \mathbf{v}'-\mathbf{u}$, where we recall that $\mathbf{v}' = \mathbf{v}+(e/mc)\mathbf{A}_{ext}$, implying $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}'-(e/mc)\mathbf{A}_{ext}$ and $\mathbf{b}_* = \mathbf{b}'_*-(e/mc)\mathbf{A}_{ext}$. Once again the osmotic potential $R(\mathbf{q},t) = \mu U(\mathbf{q},t)$ imparts to the particle an osmotic velocity $\nabla R/m = (\hbar/2m)\nabla\rho/\rho$, implying $\rho = e^{2R/\hbar}$ for all times.

As in the free particle case, we can obtain the time-symmetric mean dynamics from Yasue's variational principle. Starting from the mean lab frame, if we integrate the time-asymmetric particle phases (99) and (100) (under the replacements $\mathbf{b}\to\mathbf{b}'$ and $\mathbf{b}_*\to\mathbf{b}'_*$ in the mean forward and mean backward momentum contributions to the phases), and then average the two, we obtain [23]

[23]The proof of this is analogous to that in footnote 19 for the classical case, with $\mathbf{p}'$ replaced by $m\mathbf{b}'$ ($m\mathbf{b}'_*$) and $\mathbf{v}$ replaced by $\mathbf{b}$ ($\mathbf{b}_*$). In the $b\ll c$ approximated mean lab frame, the mean forward Lagrangian is $L_+ = (1/2)\,mb^2 + e\frac{\mathbf{b}}{\mathbf{c}}\cdot\mathbf{A}_{ext} - mc^2 - e\Phi_c$, and the Legendre transformation gives $E_+ = m\mathbf{b}'\cdot\mathbf{b} - L_+ = \left(mb^2 + e\frac{\mathbf{b}}{\mathbf{c}}\cdot\mathbf{A}_{ext}\right) - L_+ = mc^2 + (1/2)\,mb^2 + e\Phi_c$. Correspondingly, we have $L_+ = m\mathbf{b}'\cdot\mathbf{b} - E_+$. So, $S_+ = \int L_+dt + C = \int(m\mathbf{b}'\cdot\mathbf{b} - E_+)\,dt + C = \int(m\mathbf{b}'\cdot d\mathbf{q} - E_+dt) + C$. Likewise, for the mean backward motion, we obtain $S_- = \int(m\mathbf{b}'_*\cdot d\mathbf{q} - E_-dt) + C$. Accordingly, $S = (1/2)\,[S_+ + S_-]$ and is equal to (110) (recalling that $S = -\hbar\bar{\theta}$).

$$\bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2}\left[\int Edt - \int \frac{m}{2}\left(\mathbf{b}' + \mathbf{b}'_*\right)\cdot d\mathbf{q}\right]|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} + \phi, \tag{110}$$

where, using the kinematic constraints (107) and (108),

$$E|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = mc^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{1}{2}mb^2 + \frac{1}{2}mb_*^2\right]|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} + e\Phi_e|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = mc^2 + \left[\frac{1}{2}mv^2 + \frac{1}{2}mu^2\right]|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} + e\Phi_e|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}. \tag{111}$$

Then the ensemble-averaged, time-symmetric mean particle phase is given by (putting in integration limits between initial and final states),

$$\begin{aligned} J(\mathbf{q}) = \int d^3q\rho\bar{\theta}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2}\int d^3q\rho\left[\int_{t_i}^{t_f} Edt - \int_{q_i}^{q_f} m\mathbf{v}'\cdot d\mathbf{q}(t)\right] + \int d^3q\rho\phi \\ &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2}\left(\int_{t_i}^{t_f} < E > dt - \int_{q_i}^{q_f} < \mathbf{p}'\cdot d\mathbf{q}(t) >\right) + \phi. \end{aligned} \tag{112}$$

Applying the conservative diffusion constraint through the variational principle implies that the ensemble-averaged time-symmetric phase is extremal, or

$$J(\mathbf{q}) = extremal. \tag{113}$$

A straightforward computation then shows that (113) gives the mean acceleration equation,

$$m\mathbf{a}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = \frac{m}{2}\left[D_*D + DD_*\right]\mathbf{q}(t) = e\left[-\frac{1}{c}\frac{\partial\mathbf{A}_{ext}}{\partial t} - \nabla\Phi_e + \frac{\mathbf{v}}{c}\times\mathbf{B}_{ext}\right]|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}, \tag{114}$$

So we see here too that the evolution equation for the time-symmetric mean phase (110), under the conservative diffusion constraint (113), is obtained from the integral of (114).

Applying the mean derivatives in (114), we find

$$\begin{aligned} m\mathbf{a}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} &= m\left[\frac{\partial\mathbf{v}}{\partial t} + \mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla\mathbf{u} - \frac{\hbar}{2m}\nabla^2\mathbf{u}\right]|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} \\ &= e\left[-\frac{1}{c}\frac{\partial\mathbf{A}_{ext}}{\partial t} - \nabla\Phi_e + \frac{\mathbf{v}}{c}\times\mathbf{B}_{ext}\right]|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}. \end{aligned} \tag{115}$$

Making the identification

$$\mathbf{p}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = -\left(\hbar\nabla\bar{\theta} + \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}_{ext}\right)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = \left(\nabla S - \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}_{ext}\right)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}, \tag{116}$$

and inserting this relation along with (108) into (115), integration gives the total translational energy of the *zbw* particle as

$$E|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = -\frac{\partial S}{\partial t}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = mc^2 + \left[\frac{\left(\nabla S - \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}_{ext}\right)^2}{2m} + e\Phi_e - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\frac{\nabla^2\sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{\rho}}\right]|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}, \tag{117}$$

where we have fixed the integration constant equal to the particle rest energy.

The general solution of (117), i.e., the mean phase of the *zbw* particle in the time-symmetric mean lab frame, is clearly of the form

$$S|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} = \left(\int \mathbf{p}'\cdot d\mathbf{q} - \int Edt\right)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} - \hbar\phi. \tag{118}$$

As in the free particle case, (118) is the mean phase of the *zbw* particle undergoing the Nelsonian conservative diffusion process, and its dynamics differs from the dynamics of the classical *zbw* particle phase by the presence of the quantum kinetic in (117). Our earlier discussion of the quantum-classical correspondence applies here as well.

Now consider the particle phase change in the time-symmetric mean rest and lab frames. As in the classical *zbw* model, even in the presence of external fields, the *zbw* oscillation in the time-symmetric

instantaneous mean rest frame is simply harmonic, making the phase a single-valued function (up to addition of an integer multiple of 2π) of the (time-symmetric) mean space-time trajectory of the particle in the (time-symmetric) mean lab frame. So if we integrate the time-symmetric mean phase around a closed loop L with $\delta t = 0$, we will have

$$\oint_L \delta S(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \oint_L \mathbf{p}' \cdot \delta \mathbf{q}(t) = nh. \tag{119}$$

If we also consider the *zbw* phase field $S(\mathbf{q}, t)$ over the statistical ensemble, then, again by the same physical reasoning applied to each member of the ensemble, the phase change along any mathematical loop in space (with time held fixed) will be

$$\oint_L dS(\mathbf{q}, t) = \oint_L \nabla S \cdot d\mathbf{q} = \oint_L \mathbf{p}' \cdot d\mathbf{q} = nh. \tag{120}$$

The total energy field over the ensemble will correspondingly be given by (117) when $\mathbf{q}(t)$ is replaced by $\mathbf{q}$. From (120), (117), and (109), we can then construct the 1-particle Schrödinger equation in external fields as

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \frac{\left[-i\hbar\nabla - \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}_{ext}\right]^2}{2m}\psi + e\Phi_e\psi + mc^2\psi, \tag{121}$$

where $\psi(\mathbf{q}, t) = \sqrt{\rho(\mathbf{q}, t)}e^{iS(\mathbf{q},t)/\hbar}$ is a single-valued wave function as a consequence of (120).

At this point, it is worth observing an important difference between the mean *zbw* phase field evolving by (117) and the classical *zbw* phase field evolving by Eq. (61) in section 4.4. In the former case, the nonlinear coupling to the density ρ via the quantum kinetic implies that, at nodal points (i.e., where $\rho = \psi = 0$), such as found in excited states of the hydrogen atom or quantum harmonic oscillator, the phase field develops a singularity where both $\mathbf{v} = \nabla S$ and $\mathbf{u} = (\hbar/2m)\nabla ln(\rho)$ diverge. Moreover, (120) implies that the phase field along a closed loop L undergoes a discontinuous jump of magnitude nh if the loop happens to cross a nodal point. Neither of these observations are inconsistent with our hypothesis that the mean *zbw* phase of the actual particle is a well-defined function of the actual particle's mean space-time trajectory (or any mean space-time trajectory it can potentially realize), since it can be readily shown that the particle's actual trajectory never hits a nodal point [2, 4, 110, 111, 65]. [24] Indeed, if the phase field would not undergo the discontinuous jump at a nodal point, then this would imply that there are mean trajectories near nodes for which the actual particle does not have a well-defined mean phase, thereby contradicting our hypothesis. By contrast, for the classical *zbw* phase field, there is no reason for it to be undefined at nodal regions since there is no nonlinear coupling to the (inverse of the) probability density. Rather, that the classical phase field also satisfies a condition of the form (120) implies that it changes discontinuously across a discontinuity in the external potential, V, and takes discrete values for changes along a closed loop L encircling the discontinuity in V (as demonstrated for the hydrogen-like atom in Appendix B).

We thus have a formulation of ZSM in external fields that avoids the Wallstrom criticism and is ready to be applied to the central potential example considered in section 3.

5.3 The central potential revisited

With ZSM in hand, we can now return to the central potential example considered by Wallstrom, and show how ZSM gives the same result as quantum mechanics.

For the effective central potential, $V_a(\mathbf{r}) = V(\mathbf{r}) + a/r^2$, we found that the HJM equations implied $\mathbf{v}'_a = \mathbf{v}_a\sqrt{2ma/\hbar^2 + 1}$ and $\mathbf{u}'_a = \mathbf{u}_a$, where $\mathbf{v}_a = (\hbar/mr)\,\hat{\varphi}$. The problem in standard NYSM was that the constant a could take any positive real value, making $\mathbf{v}'_a$ not quantized. By contrast, in

[24] A simple proof [65] of this for the actual mean trajectory can be given as follows. First, note that the actual particle's initial mean position, $\mathbf{q}(0)$, can never be at nodal points (since this would contradict the physical meaning of ρ as the probability density for the particle to be at position $\mathbf{q}$ at time t). Now, rewrite $\partial_t\rho = -\nabla\cdot(\mathbf{v}\rho)$ as $(\partial_t + \mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla)\,\rho = -\rho\nabla\cdot\mathbf{v}$. Along the actual mean trajectory, $\mathbf{q}(t)$, we then have $(d/dt)ln[\rho(\mathbf{q}(t), t)] = -\nabla\cdot\mathbf{v}|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}$. Solving this gives $\rho(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \rho_0(\mathbf{q}_0)exp[-\int_0^t (\nabla\cdot\mathbf{v})\,|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t')}dt']$, which implies that if $\rho_0(\mathbf{q}_0) > 0$, then $\rho(\mathbf{q}(t), t) > 0$ for all times. Correspondingly, from $\rho(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$ we obtain $R(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = R_0(\mathbf{q}_0) - (\hbar/2)\int_0^t (\nabla\cdot\mathbf{v})\,|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t')}dt'$, which never becomes undefined if $R_0(\mathbf{q}_0)$ is not undefined.

the quantum mechanical version, $\mathrm{m} = \sqrt{2ma/\hbar^2 + 1}$ would be integral due to the single-valuedness condition on ψ_{m}.

In the ZSM version of this problem, the lab-frame *zbw* phase field, $S_a = \hbar\varphi$, satisfies

$$\oint \frac{dS_a}{d\varphi} d\varphi = \oint \hbar d\varphi = \mathrm{m}h, \tag{122}$$

as a consequence of the reasoning used in section 5.2. Accordingly, for the effective *zbw* phase field, $S'_a = \hbar\sqrt{2ma/\hbar^2 + 1}\varphi = \hbar\varphi'$, we will also have

$$\oint \hbar\sqrt{2ma + 1} d\varphi = \oint \hbar d\varphi' = \mathrm{m}h, \tag{123}$$

where $\mathrm{m} = \sqrt{2ma/\hbar^2 + 1}$ is integral. So ZSM predicts quantized energy-momentum in the central potential case, in accordance with quantum mechanics.

6 Conclusion

To answer Wallstrom's criticism, we first developed a classical *zbw* model (based on the earlier models of de Broglie and Bohm) which implies a quantization condition reminiscent of the Bohr-Sommerfeld-Wilson condition. We did this excluding and including interactions with external fields, and formulated the classical Hamilton-Jacobi statistical mechanics of each case. We then extended this model to Nelson-Yasue stochastic mechanics - which we termed zitterbewegung stochastic mechanics (ZSM) - and showed, using the same two cases, that it allows us to recover the Schrödinger equation for single-valued wave functions with (in general) multi-valued phases. Finally, we showed that ZSM works for the concrete case of a two-dimensional central potential.

In Part II, our approach will be generalized to the case of many *zbw* particles, excluding and including (external and inter-particle) field interactions, the latter of which turns out to be a non-trivial task. We will also: (i) elaborate on the beables of ZSM, (ii) assess the plausibility and generalizability of the *zbw* hypothesis, and (iii) compare ZSM to other (previously) proposed answers to Wallstrom's criticism.

7 Acknowledgments

I gratefully acknowledge helpful discussions with Dieter Hartmann, Herman Batelaan, and Guido Bacciagaluppi. I also thank Guido for carefully reading an earlier draft of this paper and making useful suggestions for improvements. Lastly, I thank Mike Towler for inviting me to talk on an earlier incarnation of this work at his 2010 de Broglie-Bohm research conference in Vallico Soto.

A Proof of the Stochastic Variational Principle

Following Yasue's presentation [8], let $\mathbf{q}'(t) = \mathbf{q}(t) + \delta\mathbf{q}(t)$ be a sample-wise variation of the sample path $\mathbf{q}(t)$, with end-point constraints $\delta\mathbf{q}(t_i) = \delta\mathbf{q}(t_f) = 0$. Let us also assume, for the sake of generality, that the particle has charge e and couples to the external magnetic vector potential, $\mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$, as well as the external electric scalar potential, $\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$. Then the condition

$$\begin{aligned} J &= \int d^3q\rho \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{1}{2} m\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{q}(t), t)^2 + \frac{1}{2} m\mathbf{b}_*(\mathbf{q}(t), t)^2 \right] + \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}_{ext}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \cdot \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{q}(t), t) - e\Phi_e(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \right\} dt \\ &= \int d^3q\rho \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{1}{2} m \left(D\mathbf{q}(t)\right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} m \left(D_*\mathbf{q}(t)\right)^2 \right] + \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}_{ext} \cdot \mathbf{v} - e\Phi_e \right\} dt = extremal, \end{aligned} \tag{124}$$

is equivalent to the variation,

$$\delta J(\mathbf{q}) = J(\mathbf{q}') - J(\mathbf{q}), \tag{125}$$

up to first order in $||\delta\mathbf{q}(t)||$. So (125) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\delta J = \int d^3x\rho \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \Bigg\{ \Bigg[\frac{1}{2} m \left(D\mathbf{q}(t) \cdot D\delta\mathbf{q}(t) + D_*\mathbf{q}(t) \cdot D_*\delta\mathbf{q}(t) \right) \Bigg] \\ + \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}_{ext} \cdot \frac{1}{2}\left(D\delta\mathbf{q}(t) + D_*\delta\mathbf{q}(t) \right) + \frac{e}{c}\left(\delta\mathbf{q}(t) \cdot \nabla\mathbf{A}_{ext} \right) \frac{1}{2}\left(D\mathbf{q}(t) + D_*\mathbf{q}(t) \right) - e\nabla\Phi_e \cdot \delta\mathbf{q}(t) \Bigg\} |_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} dt,\end{aligned} \tag{126}$$

where we note that $\mathbf{v} = \frac{1}{2}\left(D + D_*\right)\mathbf{q}(t)$ and is constrained by Eq. (107). Now, observing that for an arbitrary function $f(\mathbf{q}(t), t)$,

$$\int d^3q\rho \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \left[f(\mathbf{q}(t), t) D\delta\mathbf{q}(t) \right] dt = -\int d^3q\rho \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \left[\delta\mathbf{q}(t) D_* f(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \right] dt, \tag{127}$$

and

$$\int d^3q\rho \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \left[f(\mathbf{q}(t), t) D_*\delta\mathbf{q}(t) \right] dt = -\int d^3q\rho \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \left[\delta\mathbf{q}(t) D f(\mathbf{q}(t), t) \right] dt, \tag{128}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(D + D_*\right) f(\mathbf{q}(t), t) = \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2}\left[D\mathbf{q}(t) + D_*\mathbf{q}(t) \right] \cdot \nabla \right\} f(\mathbf{q}, t)|_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)}, \tag{129}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\delta J = \int d^3q\rho \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \Bigg\{ \frac{m}{2}\left[D_*D + DD_* \right] \mathbf{q}(t) \\ - \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{v} \times \left(\nabla \times \mathbf{A}_{ext} \right) + \frac{e}{c}\frac{\partial \mathbf{A}_{ext}}{\partial t} + e\nabla\Phi_e \Bigg\} |_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} \delta\mathbf{q}(t) dt + \vartheta(||\delta\mathbf{q}||).\end{aligned} \tag{130}$$

From the variational constraint (125), it follows that the first-order variation of J must be zero for arbitrary sample-wise variation $\delta\mathbf{q}(t)$. Moreover, since the ensemble-average is a positive linear functional, we will have the equation of motion

$$\frac{m}{2}\left[D_*D + DD_* \right] \mathbf{q}(t) = -e\left[\nabla\Phi_e + \frac{1}{c}\frac{\partial \mathbf{A}_{ext}}{\partial t} \right] |_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} + \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{v} \times \left(\nabla \times \mathbf{A}_{ext} \right) |_{\mathbf{q}=\mathbf{q}(t)} \tag{131}$$

for each time $t \in [t_i, t_f]$ with probability one.

B Classical Zitterbewegung in the Central Potential

Suppose that the non-relativistic *zbw* particle in the lab frame is moving in a circular orbit about some central potential, $V(\mathbf{r})$, where $\mathbf{r}$ is the radius of the orbit. In this case, for the spherical coordinates (r, α, β), r is fixed, α is time-variable, and β has the constant value $\pi/2$, giving translational velocities $\mathbf{v}_r = \dot{r} = 0$ (and we require $\ddot{r} = 0$), $\mathbf{v}_\alpha = r\dot{\alpha}$, and $\mathbf{v}_\beta = r\dot{\beta}sin\alpha = 0$. The $v \ll c$ approximated *zbw* phase change in the lab frame is then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\theta(\alpha(t), , t) &= \left(\omega_c + \omega_\alpha + \kappa(\mathbf{r}) \right) \delta t - \frac{v_\alpha \delta\alpha(t)}{c^2} \\ &= \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2}\left[\left(mc^2 + \frac{p_\alpha^2}{2mr^2} + V(\mathbf{r}) \right) \delta t - v_\alpha \delta\alpha(t) \right],\end{aligned} \tag{132}$$

where $p_\alpha = mr^2\dot{\alpha}$. Because the total energy of the system is constant, integrating this gives

$$\theta = \frac{\omega_c}{mc^2}\left[\left(mc^2 + \frac{p_\alpha^2}{2mr^2} + V(\mathbf{r})\right)t - p_\alpha\delta\alpha(t)\right] + C, \tag{133}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} S &= p_\alpha\delta\alpha(t) - \left(mc^2 + \frac{p_\alpha^2}{2mr^2} + V(\mathbf{r})\right)t + C \\ &= p_\alpha\delta\alpha(t) - Et + C. \end{aligned} \tag{134}$$

Incidentally, we could have also obtained (134) by starting with the non-relativistic Lagrangian

$$L(\alpha(t), t) = \frac{1}{2}mr^2\dot{\alpha}(t)^2 - V(\mathbf{r}) - mc^2, \tag{135}$$

and using the Legendre transformation,

$$E = p_\alpha\dot{\alpha} - L = \frac{p_\alpha^2}{2mr^2} + V(\mathbf{r}) + mc^2, \tag{136}$$

to get

$$S = \int Ldt + C = \int \left(p_\alpha\dot{\alpha} - E\right)dt + C = p_\alpha\alpha - Et + C. \tag{137}$$

Clearly (137) satisfies the classical Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$-\frac{\partial S}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2mr^2}\left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial \alpha}\right)^2 + V(\mathbf{r}), \tag{138}$$

where $-\partial S/\partial t = E$ and $\partial S/\partial\alpha = \mathbf{p}_\alpha = \mathbf{L}_\alpha$, the latter being the constant angular momentum of the particle in the $\hat{z}$-direction.

Because the *zbw* oscillation is simply harmonic and the phase is a well-defined function of the particle position, the change in S will now be quantized upon fixed time integration around a closed (circular) orbit L. In other words, we will have

$$\oint_L \delta S_\alpha = \oint_L p_\alpha\delta q_\alpha = 2\pi m v_\alpha r = nh, \tag{139}$$

or

$$L_\alpha = m v_\alpha r = n\hbar, \tag{140}$$

where n is an integer. From (140) and the force balance equation (assuming a Coulomb force), $mv_\alpha^2/r = (1/4\pi\epsilon_0)e^2/r^2$, it follows that the radius is quantized as

$$r_n = \frac{4\pi\epsilon_0\hbar^2}{m_e e^2}n^2, \tag{141}$$

where for $n = 1$, (141) gives the Bohr radius. Inserting (141) into the force balance equation and recognizing that $E = V/2$, we then obtain the quantized energy states

$$E_n = \frac{E_1}{n^2}, \tag{142}$$

where $E_1 = -e^2/8\pi\epsilon_0 r_1 = -13.6eV$ is precisely the magnitude of the ground state energy of the Bohr hydrogen atom.

We wish to emphasize that, whereas Bohr simply assumed a condition equivalent to (139) in order to stabilize the electron's circular orbit in the classical hydrogen atom, we *obtained* (139) just from the zitterbewegung hypothesis in the particle's instantaneous translational rest frame combined with the usual Lorentz transformation. In other words, in Bohr's model, (139) is imposed ad hoc while in our model it arises as a direct consequence of a relativistic (*zbw*) constraint on the particle's motion.

References

[1] I. Fényes. Eine wahrscheinlichkeitstheoretische begruending und interpretation der quantenmechanic. *Z. Physik*, 132:81–106, 1952.

[2] E. Nelson. Derivation of the schroedinger equation from newtonian mechanics. *Phys. Rev.*, 150:1079–1085, 1966.

[3] E. Nelson. *Dynamical Theories of Brownian Motion*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1967. "Osmotic velocity", Chapters 4 and 13. https://web.math.princeton.edu/ nelson/books/bmotion.pdf.

[4] E. Nelson. *Quantum Fluctuations*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1985. "Nelson-Yasue", pp. 73-77; "Physical interpretation of the wave function", pp. 81; "identical particles", pp. 100; "non-equilibrium physics", pp. 117-119; "electromagnetic origin", pp. 65; "conservative diffusions", pp. 65; "electromagnetic potentials", pp. 72-76; "nodal point", pp. 77-82; "Markovianity", pp. 128-130. https://web.math.princeton.edu/ nelson/books/qf.pdf.

[5] K. Yasue. Quantum mechanics of nonconservative systems. *Annals of Physics*, 114:479–496, 1978.

[6] K. Yasue. Stochastic quantization: A review. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 18:861–913, 1979.

[7] K. Yasue. Quantum mechanics and stochastic control theory. *J. Math. Phys.*, 22:1010–1020, 1981.

[8] K. Yasue. Stochastic calculus of variations. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 41:327–340, 1981.

[9] K. Yasue. Derivation of relativistic wave equations in the theory of elementary domains. *Progress of Theoretical Physics*, 57:318–328, 1977.

[10] F. Guerra. Structural aspects of stochastic mechanics and stochastic field theory. *Physics Reports*, 77:263–312, 1981.

[11] F. Guerra and L. Morato. Quantization of dynamical systems and stochastic control theory. *Phys. Rev. D*, 27:1774–1786, 1983.

[12] M. P. Davidson. A generalization of the fenyes-nelson stochastic model of quantum mechanics. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 3:271–277, 1979, http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0112063.

[13] M. P. Davidson (2006). Stochastic mechanics, trace dynamics, and differential space - a synthesis. http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0602211.

[14] M. Nagasawa. *Schroedinger Equations and Diffusion theory*. Birkhauser, 1996.

[15] N. Cufaro-Petroni and F. Guerra. Quantum mechanical states as attractors for nelson processes. *Found. Phys.*, 25:297, 1995.

[16] N. Cufaro-Petroni, S. De Martino, and S. De Siena. *New perspectives in the physics of mesoscopic systems*, chapter Non-equilibrium densities of Nelson processes. World Scientific, 1997.

[17] G. Bacciagaluppi. Derivation of the symmetry postulates for identical particles from pilot-wave theories. 2003, http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0302099.

[18] G. Bacciagaluppi. Non-equilibrium in stochastic mechanics. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 361:012017, 2012, http://iopscience.iop.org/1742-6596/361/1/012017/.

[19] K. Kobayashi and Y. Yamanaka. Extension of nelson's stochastic quantization to finite temperature using thermo field dynamics. *Phys. Lett. A*, 375:3243–3249, 2011, http://arxiv.org/abs/1007.3603.

[20] T. Zastawniak. A relativistic version of nelson's stochastic mechanics. *Europhysics Letters*, 13:13–17, 1990.

[21] D. Dohrn and F. Guerra. Nelson's stochastic mechanics on riemannian manifolds. *Lettere al Nuovo Cimento*, 22:121–127, 1978.

[22] D. Dohrn, F. Guerra, and P. Ruggiero. *Feynman Path Integrals (Lecture Notes in Physics vol 106)*, chapter Spinning particles and relativistic particles in the framework of Nelson's stochastic mechanics. Berlin: Springer, 1979.

[23] D. Dohrn and F. Guerra. Compatibility between the brownian metric and the kinetic metric in nelson stochastic quantization. *Phys. Rev. D*, 31:2521–2524, 1985.

[24] L. Smolin. *Quantum Concepts in Space and Time*, chapter Stochastic mechanics, hidden variables, and gravity. Oxford University Press, 1986.

[25] L. Smolin. Matrix model as non-local hidden variables theories. 2002, http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0201031.

[26] F. Markopoulou and L. Smolin. Quantum theory from quantum gravity. *Phys. Rev. D, 70, 124029*, 2004, http://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0311059.

[27] M. Serva. Relativistic stochastic processes associated to klein-gordon equation. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincare*, 49:415–432, 1988.

[28] R. Marra and M. Serva. Variational principles for a relativistic stochastic mechanics. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincare*, 53:97–108, 1990.

[29] E. Aldrovandi, D. Dohrn, and F. Guerra. Stochastic action of dynamical systems on curved manifolds: The geodesic interpolation. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 31:639–648, 1990.

[30] E. Aldrovandi, D. Dohrn, and F. Guerra. The lagrangian approach to stochastic variational principles on curved manifolds. *Acta Applicandae Mathematicae*, 26:219–236, 1992.

[31] P. Garbaczewski. Relativistic problem of random flights and nelson's stochastic mechanics. *Phys. Lett. A*, 164:6–16, 1992, http://www.fiz.uni.opole.pl/pgar/documents/pla92b.pdf.

[32] L. M. Morato and L. Viola. Markov diffusions in comoving coordinates and stochastic quantization of the free relativistic spinless particle. *J. Math. Phys.*, 36:4691–4710, 1995.

[33] T. G. Dankel Jr. Mechanics on manifolds and the incorporation of spin into nelson's stochastic mechanics. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 37:192–221, 1970.

[34] W. G. Faris. Spin correlation in stochastic mechanics. *Found. Phys.*, 12:1–26, 1982.

[35] G. F. de Angelis, G. Jona-Lasinio, M. Serva, and N. Zanghi. Stochastic mechanics of a dirac particle in two spacetime dimensions. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, 19:865, 1986, http://iopscience.iop.org/0305-4470/19/6/017/pdf/jav19i6p865.pdf.

[36] P. Blanchard, S. Golin, and M. Serva. Repeated measurements in stochastic mechanics. *Phys. Rev. D*, 34:3732, 1986.

[37] S. Goldstein. Stochastic mechanics and quantum theory. *Journal of Statistical Physics, Vol. 47, Nos. 5/6.*, 47:645–667, 1987. Quote on pp. 664, section 11.9.

[38] M. Jibu, T. Misawa, and K. Yasue. Measurement and reduction of wavefunction in stochastic mechanics. *Phys. Lett. A*, 150:59–62, 1990.

[39] P. Blanchard, M. Cini, and M. Serva. *Ideas and Methods in Quantum and Statistical Physics*, chapter The measurement problem in the stochastic formulation of quantum mechanics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992.

[40] G. Peruzzi and A. Rimini. Quantum measurement in a family of hidden-variable theories. *Foundations of Physics Letters*, 9:505–519, 1996, http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9607004.

[41] S. Roy and R. Llinás. Relevance of quantum mechanics on some aspects of ion channel function. *C. R. Biologies, 332, 517-522*, 2009.

[42] S. Bhattacharya, S. Dutta, and S. Roy. Schroedinger-langevin equation and ion transport at nano scale. *Journal of Modern Physics, 2, 231-235*, 2011, http://www.scirp.org/journal/PaperInformation.aspx?PaperID=4719.

[43] T. Koide and T. Kodoma. Stochastic variational method as quantization scheme i: Hamiltonian form and uncertainty relation. 2013, http://arxiv.org/abs/1208.0258v2.

[44] F. Guerra and P. Ruggiero. New interpretation of the euclidean-markov field in the framework of physical minkowski space-time. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 31:1022, 1973.

[45] K. Yasue. Stochastic quantization of wave fields and its application to dissipatively interacting fields. *J. Math. Phys.*, 19:1892, 1978.

[46] M. P. Davidson. The generalized fenyes-nelson model for free scalar field theory. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 4:101–106, 1980, http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0211097.

[47] T. Koide and T. Kodoma. Stochastic variational method as quantization scheme i: Field quantization of complex klein-gordon equation. *Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys. (9): 093A03*, 2015 http://arxiv.org/abs/1306.6922V3.

[48] F. Guerra and M. I. Loffredo. Stochastic equations for the maxwell field. *Lettre al Nuovo Cimento*, 27:41–45, 1979.

[49] T. Koide and T. Kodoma. Stochastic variational method as a quantization scheme ii: Quantization of electromagnetic fields. 2014, http://arxiv.org/abs/1406.6295.

[50] S. De Siena, F. Guerra, and P. Ruggiero. Stochastic quantization of the vector-meson field. *Phys. Rev. D*, 27:2912– 2915, 1983.

[51] M. P. Davidson. Stochastic quantization of the linearized gravitational field. *J. Math. Phys.*, 23:132–137, 1982, http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0112076.

[52] S. C. Lim. Finite temperature field from stochastic mechanics. *Phys. Lett. B*, 188:239–245, 1987.

[53] L. F. Santos and C. O. Escobar. Stochastic motion of an open bosonic string. *Phys. Lett. A, 256, 89-94*, 1999, http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9806044v2.

[54] T. C. Wallstrom. On the derivation of the schroedinger equation from stochastic mechanics. *Foundations of Physics Letters*, 2:113–126, 1989.

[55] T. C. Wallstrom. Inequivalence between the schroedinger equation and the madelung hydrodynamic equations. *Phys. Rev. A*, 49:1613–1617, 1994.

[56] E. A. Carlen and M. I. Loffredo. The correspondence between stochastic mechanics and quantum mechanics on multiply connected configuration spaces. *Phys. Lett. A*, 141:9–13, 1989.

[57] G. Bacciagaluppi. *Endophysics, Time, Quantum and the Subjective*, chapter A Conceptual Introduction to Nelson's Mechanics, pages 367–88, http://philsci–archive.pitt.edu/8853/. Singapore: World Scientific, 2005.

[58] L. Smolin (2006). Could quantum mechanics be an approximation to another theory? http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0609109.

[59] L. Fritsche and M. Haugk (2009). Stochastic foundation of quantum mechanics and the origin of particle spin. http://arxiv.org/abs/0912.3442.

[60] A. Caticha. Entropic dynamics, time and quantum theory. *J. Phys. A. 44:225303*, 2011, http://arxiv.org/abs/1005.2357.

[61] I. Schmelzer (2011). An answer to the wallstrom objection against nelsonian stochastics. http://arxiv.org/abs/1101.5774.

[62] G. Groessing, J. M. Pascasio, and H. Schwabl. A classical explanation of quantization. *Found. Phys.*, 41:1437–1453, 2011, http://arxiv.org/abs/0812.3561.

[63] David Wallace. *The Emergent Multiverse: Quantum Theory according to the Everett Interpretation*. Oxford University Press, 2012.

[64] L. Vaidman. Many-worlds interpretation of quantum mechanics. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2014, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/qm-manyworlds/.

[65] P. R. Holland. *The Quantum Theory of Motion: An Account of the de Broglie-Bohm Causal Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993. "Hamilton-Jacobi formulation", "Gibbsian statistical ensemble", "nonlinear Schrödinger equation", and "continuity equation", Chapter 2; "polar decomposition", pp. 68-72; "nodal point(s)", pp. 85-86.

[66] D. Bohm and B. J. Hiley. *The Undivided Universe: An Ontological Interpretation of Quantum Theory*. Routledge, 1995.

[67] D. Duerr and S. Teufel. *Bohmian Mechanics: The Physics and Mathematics of Quantum Theory*. Springer, 2009.

[68] G. Ghirardi. Collapse theories. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2011. (Available online at http://plato.stanford.edu/).

[69] S. Adler. Quantum theory as an emergent phenomenon: Foundation and phenomenology. *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. 361, 012002*, 2012, http://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1742-6596/361/1/012002/meta.

[70] M. J. W. Hall, D. A. Deckert, and H. M. Wiseman. Quantum phenomena modeled by interactions between many classical worlds. *Phy. Rev. X*, 4:041013, 2014, http://arxiv.org/abs/1402.6144.

[71] D. Duerr, S. Goldstein, and N. Zanghi. Quantum equilibrium and the origin of absolute uncertainty. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 67:843–907, 1992, http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0308039v1.

[72] D. Bohm. A suggested interpretation of the quantum theory in terms of "hidden" variables. i. *Phy. Rev. 85, 166*, 1952.

[73] D. Bohm. A suggested interpretation of the quantum theory in terms of "hidden" variables. ii. *Phys. Rev. 85, 180*, 1952.

[74] P. Pearle and A. Valentini. *Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Physics*, chapter Generalizations of Quantum Mechanics. Elsevier, North-Holland, 2006, http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0506115.

[75] L. de la Pena and A. M. Cetto. Does quantum mechanics accept a stochastic support? *Found. Phys. 12 1017-37*, 1982.

[76] G. Bacciagaluppi. Nelsonian mechanics revisited. *Found. Phys. Lett. 12, 1-16*, 1999, http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9811040.

[77] P. Holland and C. Philippidis. Implications of lorentz covariance for the guidance equation in two-slit quantum interference. *Phys. Rev. A 67, 062105*, 2003, http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0302076.

[78] R. Schiller. Quasi-classical theory of the nonspinning electron. *Phys. Rev.*, 125:1100, 1962.

[79] N. Rosen. The relation between classical and quantum mechanics. *American Journal of Physics*, 32:597–600, 1964.

[80] P. Ghose. A continuous transition between quantum and classical mechanics. i. *Foundations of Physics vol. 32, pp. 871-892*, 32:871–892, 2002, http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0104104.

[81] H. Nikolic. Classical mechanics without determinism. *Found. Phys. Lett.*, 19:553–566, 2006, http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0505143.

[82] H. Nikolic. Classical mechanics as nonlinear quantum mechanics. *AIP Conf. Proc.*, 962:162–167, 2007, http://arxiv.org/abs/0707.2319.

[83] D. Bohm and B. J. Hiley. Non-locality and locality in the stochastic interpretation of quantum mechanics. *Physics Reports*, 172:93–122, 1989.

[84] A. Kyprianidis. The principles of a stochastic formulation of quantum theory. *Found. Phys.*, 22:1449–1483, 1992.

[85] L. Smolin. A real ensemble interpretation of quantum mechanics. *Foundations of Physics, Vol. 42, 10, pp. 1239-1261*, 2012, http://arxiv.org/abs/1104.2822.

[86] H. Hasegawa. Self-contained framework of stochastic mechanics for reconstructing the onsager machlup theory. *Phys. Rev. D. 33 (8), 2508*, 1986.

[87] T. Takabayasi. On the formulation of quantum mechanics associated with classical pictures. *Prog. Theor. Phys.*, 8:143–182, 1952, http://ptp.oxfordjournals.org/content/8/2/143.

[88] M. F. Pusey, J. Barrett, and T. Rudolph. On the reality of the quantum state. *Nature Physics*, 8:475–478, 2012, http://arxiv.org/abs/1111.3328.

[89] S. Albeverio and R. Høegh-Krohn. A remark on the connection between stochastic mechanics and the heat equation. *J. Math. Phys. 15, 1745-1747*, 1974.

[90] E. Schroedinger. Die mehrdeutigkeit der wellefunktion. *Annalen der Physik*, 32:49–55, 1938.

[91] D. Bohm. *Quantum Theory*. Prentice-Hall, 1951.

[92] E. Merzbacher. Single valuedness of wave functions. *American Journal of Physics*, 30:237–247, 1962.

[93] P. M. Matthews and K. Venkatesan. *A Textbook of Quantum Mechanics*. Mcgraw-Hill, 1979.

[94] W. C. Henneberger and T. Opatrny. When is the wave function single-valued? *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 33:1783–1795, 1994.

[95] Louis-Victor de Broglie. *On the Theory of Quanta*. PhD thesis, University of Paris, 1925.

[96] O. Darrigol. *Strangeness and soundness in Louis de Broglie's early works*. L.S. Olschki, 1994.

[97] D. Bohm. *Observation and Interpretation: A Symposium of Philosophers and Physicists*, chapter A proposed explanation of quantum theory in terms of hidden variables at a sub-quantum-mechanical level, pages 33–40. Butterworths Scientific Publications, 1957.

[98] D. Bohm. *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*, chapter Explanation of the quantization of action, pages 122–133. Routledge, 2002.

[99] H. Goldstein, C. P. Poole, and J. Safko. *Classical Mechanics*. Pearson Education: 3rd, International Economy Edition edition, 2011.

[100] J. V. Jose and E. Saletan. *Classical Dynamics: A Contemporary Approach*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 1 edition, 1998.

[101] S. Ray and J. Shamanna. On virtual displacement and virtual work in lagrangian dynamics. *European Journal of Physics*, 27:311–329, 2006, http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0510204.

[102] G. A. Schott. The electromagnetic field of a moving uniformly and rigidly electrified sphere and its radiationless orbits. *Phil. Mag. Vol. 15, Ser. 7, 752-761*, 1933.

[103] G. A. Schott. The general motion of a spinning uniformly and rigidly electrified sphere, iii. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A 159, 548-570*, 1937.

[104] G. A. Schott. The uniform circular motion with invariable normal spin of a rigidly and uniformly electrified sphere, iv. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A 159, 570-591*, 1937.

[105] D. Bohm and M. Weinstein. The self-oscillations of a charged particle. *Phys. Rev. 74, 1789-1798*, 1948.

[106] B. J. Bichsel, M. A. Morrison, N. Shafer-Rey, and E. R. I. Abraham. Experimental and theoretical investigation of the stark effect for manipulating cold molecules: Application to nitric oxide. *Phys. Rev. A*, 75:023410, 2007, http://www.nhn.ou.edu/ morrison/Research/Papers/BMS06.pdf.

[107] V. Allori. *Decoherence and the Classical Limit of Quantum Mechanics*. PhD thesis, Universita degli Studi di Genova, 2001, http://www.niu.edu/ vallori/tesi.pdf.

[108] G. E. Bowman. On the classical limit in bohm's theory. *Foundations of Physics, Vol. 35, 4, pp. 605-625*, 2005.

[109] X. Oriols, D. Tena, and A. Benseny. Natural classical limit for the center of mass of many-particle quantum systems. 2016, https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.03988.

[110] P. Blanchard and S. Golin. Diffusion process with singular drift fields. *Commun. Math. Phys. 109, 421-435*, 1987.

[111] T. C. Wallstrom. A finite-energy bound on the approach of a diffusion to the zeros of its density. In *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, Volume 108, Number 3*, 1990.